Overview

- Traditional account of reconstruction:
  Be it via resumption or not, if an XP allows for (A’) reconstruction, (A’) movement of that XP has occurred (see Lebeaux (1990), Chomsky (1995), Aoun et al. (2001) among others).

- Problem:
  Reconstruction with resumption inside strong islands in French and Jordanian Arabic.

- Our claim:
  If an XP allows for reconstruction, a copy of that XP (rather than movement of that XP) is present.
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{This copy can be created either by movement or ellipsis. Generalizing NP-deletion’s analysis of pronouns (Elbourne (2001)) to resumption, reconstruction effects will follow.} \]

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?
  \[ \Rightarrow (1a) \text{ and } (1b) \text{ both have a ‘reconstructed’ functional reading.} \]

(1a) \[ \rightarrow \text{a different picture for each man.} \]

- Binding reconstruction: him is interpreted as a variable bound by the quantifier.
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(1b) → a different patient for every doctor.

• Scope 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

(b) Which patient did every doctor examine patient?

Copies as indefinite objects: crucially, copies in (2a) and (2b) can be interpreted as indefinite (see Kayne (1994) for arguments with relative clauses), and more precisely as skolemized choice function proposed in Kratzer (1998) and Bautista (2001).

Skolemized choice function: a function that takes two arguments, one individual x and a set of entities P and returns one individual of that set (written \(f_x(P)\)):

(3) Every man loves a woman.
⇒ Functional reading: one different specific woman for each man
LF: every man\(_1\) loves \(f_1(\text{woman})\).
\[\forall x. [\text{man}(x) \rightarrow [\text{loves}(x, f_x(\text{woman}))]]\]

⇒ Skolemized choice function’s interpretation of copies is essential to account for scope reconstruction in (2b):

(4) Partial LF of (2b): \(\lambda p. \exists f. \text{true}(p) \land p = \text{every doctor}\_x \text{ examined } f_x(\text{patient})\)
⇒ ‘reconstructed’ functional reading mapping every doctor to a different patient

Assumption 1: If an XP allows for reconstruction, movement of that XP has occurred.

2 What about Resumption?

Resumption: when a pronoun occupies a site where a gap (A’ trace) would be expected. Resumptive strategy exhibits two major properties:
• it can cross islands;
• it can allow for reconstruction.

Resumptive strategy can circumvent islandhood\(^2\), as illustrated with \(wh\)-question and dislocation from French in (5a) and (5b), and dislocation from Lebanese Arabic in (5c):

---

\(^1\)Presence of binding reconstruction in restrictive relatives argues for head-raising analysis, as initially proposed by Vergnaud (1973).

\(^2\)For lack of space, we don’t consider other possible approaches to such phenomenon based on the notion of complex or functional traces (see Engdahl (1980)) or on variable-free semantics (see Jacobson (1999)). Just note that these approaches can hardly account for the distinction between gap and resumption wrt reconstruction (see section 5).

\(^3\)when movement is banned in structures such as adjuncts, complex-NPs (strong islands), or highly restricted in others such as \(wh\)-structures (weak islands). Notice that only strong islands will be investigated here.
(5) (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 ?rifto ?enno this-the-defendant surprised-2pl because learnt-2pl that ?habasuw-* (?a)].imprisonned-her
‘This defendant, you were surprised because you learnt they sent her to jail.’
⇒ Insertion of a pronoun in (5a), (5b), and (5c) rescues the sentence

Resumption allows for reconstruction. Consider the contrast noticed by Aoun et al. (2001) with dislocation structures from Lebanese Arabic (similar data by Guilliot (to appear) with relative clauses from Breton):

(6) (a) [talmiiz-a1 l-koskeen]2 ma baddna n?abbir wala m?allme1 ?enno student-her the-bad Neg want-1p tell-1p no teacher that ?huwwe2 zo?bar b-l-fahis he cheated-3sm in-the-exam
‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated on the exam.’
⇒ No island → ‘reconstructed’ functional reading available
(b) *[talmiiz-a1 l-koskeen]2 ma ?kiina ma? wala m?allme1 ?able-ma student-her the-bad Neg talked-1p with no teacher before ?huwwe2 yuusal he arrive-3sm
‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he arrived.’
⇒ Strong island → no ‘reconstructed’ functional reading

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

(7) Apparent resumption when no island:
[DP ... pronoun1 ...]2 [IP ... QP1 ...[CP ...[DP [DP ... pronoun1 ...]2 RP2 ]]]
(8) True resumption within island:
[DP ... pronoun1 ...]2 [IP ... QP1 ...[Island ...[DP RP2 ]]]

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

Table 1. Reconstruction with Resumption

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

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.
2.1 The Paradox

**Assumption 1:** If an XP allows for reconstruction, movement of that XP has occurred.

**Assumption 2:** Even with resumption, if an XP allows for reconstruction, movement of that XP has occurred.

⇒ These two conclusions lead to the following prediction:

**Reconstruction of an XP should never occur within islands.**

However, consider the following dislocation structures from Jordanian Arabic (JA) in (9) and French in (10), and *wh-* structures from French in (11). All these examples involve resumption (clitic or doubled clitic) within a strong island (adjunct):

(9) [تالیب-ها لکسول / نا وزیlat لاپANNAH
student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because
لمودیرrah کذیfat-ob2 / -ob2 هومن 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.’

(10) *La photo de sa classe, tu es fâché parce que chaque prof l’a déchirée.*
‘The picture of his class, you are furious because each teacher tore it.’

(11) *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?’

⇒ The examples in (9), (10) and (11) can all have a ‘reconstructed’ functional reading:

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

(11) → 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 parameters:\footnote{Obviously, 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.}:

- the type of resumption
- the type of binding condition.
3.1 The type of resumption: weak vs strong

<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, as shown in (12a).

⇒ **Strong** resumptives (strong pronoun or epithet) in strong islands **ban** the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading (see (12b)).

(12) (a) \[talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul]_2 ma ḥakjan ma[l] /wala mʕ almustih]_1 gabl-ma

student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before

\[uf-uh_2 / -uh_2 hu_2 l-mudiirah

\[saw.3sf-\text{Cl} / -\text{Cl} \text{ he the-principal.3sf}

‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before the principal saw him.’

⇒ (Dbled) Clitic in adjunct → ‘reconstructed’ reading available

(b) \*\[talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul]_2 ma ḥakjan ma[l] /wala mʕ almustih]_1 gabl-ma

student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before

\[hu_2 / ha-l]-[a]b_2 yesal

\[he / the-idiot.3sm \text{ arrive.3sm}

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

⇒ **Strong pronoun/epithet in adjunct → no ‘reconstructed’ reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak resumption</th>
<th>Strong island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong resumption</th>
<th>no reconstruction with BVA (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption

3.2 The type of binding condition: positive vs negative

**Weak Resumption**, whether or not an island appears in the structure, gives rise to:

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

(13) (a) \[talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul]_2 ma beddna ngol /[l-wala mʕ almustih]_1 ?enno

student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that

\[l-mudiirah tardat-oh_2 mn l-madrase

the-principal expelled.3sm.-\text{Cl} from the-school

‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that the principal expelled him from the school.’

⇒ **BVA with no island → ‘reconstructed’ reading available**
When Resumption determines Reconstruction, N. Guilliot & N. Malkawi, 25th WCCFL

(b) 'alamit2 Karim1, bitfakir ?innu pro1 lazim ?qagg ribs2.
grade Karim think.2sm that he must change-it 'Karim’s grade, you think that he must change it.'
⇒ Condition C with no island → no ‘reconstructed’ reading

(14) (a) [talib-][ha1] l-kassoul2 ma zK lat /wala m'hallih1 laqannuh
student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because
l-mudiirah koh[af-at-oh2] / -oh2 hu2
the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he 'Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him.'
⇒ BVA with adjunct island → ‘reconstructed’ reading available

(b) [alakhu Laila1/2 pro1 zul lat laqannuh l-mudiirah tardat-uh2
brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-CL
'The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.'
⇒ Condition C with adjunct island → no ‘reconstructed’ reading

Strong Resumption does not exhibit this contrast:
• reconstruction with any binding condition when no island intervenes;
• no reconstruction (with any binding condition) when a strong island intervenes.

(15) (a) [talib-][ha1] l-kassoul2 ma beddna ngol [l-wala m'hallih1 ?enno
student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that
hu2 ?qaf b-l-mthn
he cheated.3sm in-the-exam
'Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.'
⇒ BVA with no island → ‘reconstructed’ reading available

(b) *[alakhu Laila1/2 pro1 galat ?innu hu2 / ha-l-habilh2 safar
brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
'The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.'
⇒ Condition C with no island → ‘reconstructed’ reading

(16) (a) *[talib-][ha1] l-kassoul2 ma hakjan moh [wala m'hallih1 gabl-ma
student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu2 / ha-l-qab2 yesal
he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
'Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.'
⇒ BVA with adjunct island → no ‘reconstructed’ reading

Notice that Condition A unsurprisingly behaves strictly in parallel to BVA, as both conditions are positive binding conditions.
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(b) ḫakhu Laila₁/₂ pro₁ zil-lat laṭ-an-nuh ha₂ / ha-l-ha-bi-lih₂ safar

‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because he/the idiot left.’

⇒ Condition C with ajunct island → no ‘reconstructed’ reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No island</th>
<th>Strong island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak resumption</td>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√), not with cond. C (√)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong resumption</td>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√) and with Cond. C (*)</td>
<td>no reconstruction with BVA (*) and with Cond. C (√)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4 Main proposal

Central claim: If an XP allows for 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:

(17) (a) [DP [D the/it] NP ]
     (b) [DP the/it 1 ]

⇒ In (17a), the pronoun takes an NP-complement as argument (undergoing NP-deletion under identity with a linguistic antecedent).
⇒ In (17b), 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 (17a)), or the index (see (17b)).

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 is also predicted.
⇒ Reconstruction is available with BVA in (19) as weak resumptives can be analysed with
the NP-argument, giving rise to the schemas in (20) where the pronoun can be interpreted in the scope of the quantifier:

\[(19) \quad \text{talib-[ha]_1 l-kassoul} \quad \text{ma ziYlat} \quad \text{wala m'allmih}_1 \quad \text{la' annuh} \quad \text{student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because}\]

\[\text{l-mudirirah kolh[at-oh} / -oh hu mn l-madrase the-principal expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from-the-school}\]

\[\text{Her bad student, no teacher was upset because the principal expelled him from school.}\]

\[(b) \quad \text{La photo de sa classe, tu es persuadé que chaque prof a déchiré.}\]

\[\text{The picture of his class, you are sure that each teacher tore it.}\]

\[\Rightarrow \quad \text{Reconstruction is absent with Condition C in (21) as weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (no elided NP), giving rise the schemas in (22):}\]

\[(21) \quad \text{Rakhu Laila}_1/2 \quad \text{pro}_1 \quad \text{ziYlat} \quad \text{l'ai annuh} \quad \text{l-mudirirah} \quad \text{tardat-uh}_2 \quad \text{brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl}\]

\[\text{// -uh}_2 \quad \text{hu}_2 \quad \text{// CL he}\]

\[\text{The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.}\]

\[(b) \quad \text{Le crayon de Laila, je suis persuadé qu'elle a volé.}\]

\[\text{Lit. The pen of Laila, I'm sure that she stole it.}\]

\[\Rightarrow \quad \text{Reconstruction is absent with Condition C in (21) as weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (no elided NP), giving rise the schemas in (22):}\]

\[(22) \quad \text{Rakhu Laila}_1/2 \quad \text{pro}_1 \quad \text{ziYlat} \quad \text{l'ai annuh} \quad \text{l-mudirirah} \quad \text{tardat-uh}_2 \quad \text{brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl}\]

\[\text{// -uh}_2 \quad \text{hu}_2 \quad \text{// CL he}\]

\[\text{The pen of Laila, I'm sure that she stole it.}\]

\[\Rightarrow \quad \text{Reconstruction is absent with Condition C in (21) as weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (no elided NP), giving rise the schemas in (22):}\]

4.2 Strong resumptives: reconstruction through movement

Recall Aoun et al. (2001)’s analysis of apparent resumption in (7) repeated here in (23):

\[\text{(23) Apparent resumption:}\]

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

\[\text{Note that this analysis is on a par with Elbourne (2001)’s analysis of ‘paycheck’ sentences in which the presence of the bound pronoun in the elided copy straightforwardly accounts for the ‘covariant’ reading of the pronoun ‘it’:}\]

\[(18) \quad \text{John gave his paycheck to his mistress. Everybody else put it in the bank.}\]

\[\text{John}_1 \quad \text{gave his}_1 \quad \text{paycheck to his mistress. Everybody}_2 \quad \text{else put [DP it [NP paycheck of him]}_2\text{]] in the bank.}\]
Aoun et al. (2001) propose this structure for all kinds of resumption. But, as pointed out by (Elbourne, 2001, chap.3), weak pronouns cannot be cliticized onto DPs in the surface (see (24a)). Notice, however, that both strong pronouns in (24b) and epithets (24c) can appear overtly adjoined (be used in apposition) to a DP:

\[(24)\]  
\[(a)\] *Karim-uh illi juft-uh mat
Karim-Cl that saw.1s-Cl dead
‘Karim that I saw is dead.’
\[(b)\] hu Karim illi juft-uh mat
he Karim that saw.1s-Cl dead
‘Karim that I saw is dead.’
\[(c)\] juft Karim ha-t-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.

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

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

Sensitivity to islands is predicted. Reconstruction is blocked whenever a strong island intervenes, as the contrast between (25) and (26) shows.

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 (25)). Otherwise (strong island), no reconstruction appears (no condition C violation, but violation of BVA in (26)).

\[(25)\] reconstruction with BVA/Condition C in no island context:

\[(a)\] [talib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma beddna ngol [l-wala mʕalminh]₁ ?enno
student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that
hu₂ ḥaf b-l-mtḥan
he cheated.3sm in-the-exam
‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’
\[(b)\] *[Rakhu Laila]₁ pro₁ galat ?innu hu₂ / ha-t-habilih₂ safar
brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’

\[(26)\] no reconstruction with BVA/Condition C in strong island context:

\[(a)\] *[talib-[ha]₁ l-kassoul]₂ ma hakjān maʕi [wala mʕalminh]₁ gabl-ma
student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before
hu₂ / ha-l-ḥabīlī₂ yesal
he / the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’
(b) ṭakhu Laila₂ pro₁ zillat laṭannuh ḫu₂ / ḫa-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.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Resumption</th>
<th>Strong Resumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction via ellipsis (à la Elbourne (2001))</td>
<td>Reconstruction via movement (à la Aoun et al. (2001))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>Not with Cond. C (*), or with Cond. C (√)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No island</th>
<th>Strong island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
<td>reconstruction with BVA (√), not with Cond. C (√)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Summary

5 Further support: on copy interpretation

Further support for this approach comes from the way copies get interpreted, and more precisely the fact that resumption will force a definite interpretation of the copy. Consider the following contrasts in French and JA respectively:

(27) (a) Quelle photo₁ chaque homme a-t-il déchirée _1 ? (√functional)
‘Which picture did each man tear?’

(b) Quelle photo₁ es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme _1 a déchirée? (*funct.)
‘Which picture are you furious because every man tore it?’

(c) Quelle photo₁ de lui es-tu fâché parce que chaque homme _1 a déchirée? (√f.)
‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore it?’

(28) (a) ?ayā surah₁ kul zalamih mazañi _1 ? (√functional)
Which picture every man tear past
‘Which picture did each man tear?’

(b) ?ayā surah₁ kul zalamih mazañi -ha₁ ? (*functional)
Which picture every man tear past-Cl
‘Which picture did each man tear (it)?’

(c) ?ayā surah₁ il-uh₂ kul zalamih₂ mazañi -ha₁ ? (√functional)
Which picture of-him every man tear past-Cl
‘Which picture of him did each man tear (it)?’

⇒ The ‘reconstructed’ functional reading is available with a gap, as shown by (27a) for French, and (28a) for JA, but surprisingly disappears with resumption, as shown by (27b) for French and (28b) for JA⁸. And even more surprisingly, the functional reading reappears in (27c) and (28c), as a case of binding reconstruction.

Our account: Presence of resumption (as a definite description) just blocks interpretation of the copy as indefinite, leading to the schemas in (29).

⁸This contrast was first discussed by Doron (1982) with relative clauses in Hebrew. Also notice that this contrast is not expected under any approach based on the notion of complex traces (see Engdahl (1980)) or on variable-free semantics (see Jacobson (1999)), because pronouns should also be able to be treated as complex in the former, and because the latter treats pronouns as the identity function.
When Resumption determines Reconstruction, N. Guilliot & N. Malkawi, 25th WCCFL

(29) (a) **Scope Reconstruction with a Gap:**
quelle photo ... chaque homme2 ... $[DP [NP \text{photo}]]$
which picture ... each man2 ... $[DP [NP \text{picture}]]$
⇒ LF: $\lambda p. \exists f. \text{true}(p) \land p=\text{each man}_x \text{ tore } f_x(\text{picture})$

(b) **No Scope Reconstruction with Resumption:**
quelle photo ... chaque homme2 ... $[DP \text{ l'} [NP \text{photo}]]$
which picture ... each man2 ... $[DP \text{ it } [NP \text{picture}]]$
⇒ LF: $\lambda p. \exists y. \text{true}(p) \land p=\text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture identical to } y$

(c) **Binding reconstruction with Resumption**
quelle photo de lui2 ... chaque homme2 ... $[DP \text{ l'} [NP \text{photo de lui}2]]$
which picture of him2 ... each man2 ... $[DP \text{ it } [NP \text{picture of him}_2]]$
⇒ LF: $\lambda p. \text{true}(p) \land p=\text{you are furious because each man}_x \text{ tore the picture of } x$

⇒ In (29a), interpretation of the copy as a skolemized choice function (indefinite) gives rise to the functional reading. In (29b) and (29c) the copy is interpreted as definite because of the resumptive pronoun. Functional reading with resumption will then only follow from the presence of a bound pronoun, as in (29c).

6 Conclusion

- (A’) Reconstruction cannot rely exclusively on the presence of (A’) movement, as reconstruction (linked to binding) can occur within islands (data from French and JA).
- Reconstruction signals the presence of a copy rather than the presence of movement.
  ⇒ For weak resumption, we argue for reconstruction via NP-deletion’s analysis of pronouns à la Elbourne (2001);
  ⇒ For strong resumption, we argue for reconstruction via movement in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001).

- Resumption forces interpretation of the copy as definite.

- Functional readings follow either from indefinite interpretation of the copy (scope reconstruction), or from the presence of a bound pronoun in that copy (binding reconstruction).
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