When Resumption determines Reconstruction[*]

Nicolas GUILLIOT   &   Nouman MALKAWI

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

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

University of NANTES—LLING EA3827

25th WCCFL—April 28-30, 2006

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.
⇒ 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?

⇒ (1a) and (1b) both have a 'reconstructed' functional reading.

   (1a) → a different *picture* for *each man*.
   - Binding reconstruction: *him* is interpreted as a variable bound by the quantifier.

(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~~[1].

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

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

(4)   *Partial LF of (2b):* $\lambda p.\exists f.\ true(p) \wedge p = every\ doctor_x\ examined\ f_x(patient)$
   ⇒ '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[3], 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   tfeejaʕto   [Adjunct Island laʔnno   ʕrifto   ʔenno*
           this-the-defendant   surprised-*2pl*   because   learnt-*2pl*   that
           ħabasuw-(**a**)].*
           imprisonned-her
           'This defendant, you were surprised because you learnt they sent her to jail.'

$\Rightarrow$ Insertion of a pronoun in (5a), (5b), and (5c) rescues the sentence[4].

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) *[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.'

     $\Rightarrow$ **No island $\rightarrow$ 'reconstructed' functional reading available**

     (b) **[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
           ***huwwe_2**   yuusal*
           he   arrive-*3sm*
           'Her_1 bad student_2, we didn't talk to any teacher_1 before **he_2** arrived.'

     $\Rightarrow$ **Strong island $\rightarrow$ no 'reconstructed' functional reading**

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

(7) *Apparent resumption when no island:*
     $[_{DP} ...\ \text{pronoun}_1\ ...]_2\ [_{IP} ...\ QP_1\ ...[_{CP} ...[_{DP}\ [_{DP} ...\ \text{pronoun}_1\ ...]_2\ RP_2]\ ]]$

(8) *True resumption within island:*
     $[_{DP} ...\ \text{pronoun}_{*1}\ ...]_2\ [_{IP} ...\ QP_1\ ...[_{Island} ...[_{DP}\ RP_2]\ ]]$

Apparent resumption	True resumption
Reconstruction	No reconstruction

Table 1. Reconstruction with Resumption

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

---

[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.

2.1 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.

$\Rightarrow$ 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) *[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.'

(10) *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**.'

(11) *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**?'

$\Rightarrow$ The examples in (9), (10) and (11) can all have a 'reconstructed' functional reading:

(9) $\rightarrow$ a different *student* for *each teacher* (strict mapping teacher/picture).
• Binding reconstruction: the possessive *-ha* 'her' is interpreted as a bound variable.

(11) $\rightarrow$ 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[5]:
• the type of resumption
• the type of binding condition.

---

[5]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.

3.1   The type of resumption: weak vs strong

Weak resumption	Strong resumption
Clitics	Strong pronouns
Doubled clitics	Epithets

Table 2. Typology of Resumption

⇒ **Weak** resumptives (clitic or doubled clitic) in strong islands **allow** for the 'reconstructed' functional reading, as shown in (12a).
⇒ **Strong** resumptives (strong pronoun or epithet) in strong islands **ban** the 'reconstructed' functional reading (see (12b)).

(12)   (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-uh₂   /   -uh₂   hu₂   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.'

   ⇒   **(Dbled) Clitic in adjunct → 'reconstructed' reading available**

   (b) **[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.'

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

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

Table 3. Reconstruction: weak vs strong resumption

3.2   The type of binding condition: positive vs negative

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) *[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-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.'

   ⇒ **BVA with no island → 'reconstructed' reading available**

(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.'

⇒ **Condition C with no island → no 'reconstructed' reading**

(14)   (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$_2$
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**[6]

(b)   *[ʔakhu   Laila$_1$]$_2$ pro$_1$ ziʕlat   laʔannuh   l-mudiirah   tardat-uh$_2$*
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)   *[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
hu$_2$ ġaʃ   b-l-mtiħan
he   cheated.*3.sm*   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)   *[ʔakhu   Laila$_1$]$_2$ pro$_1$ galat   ʔinnu   hu$_2$ /   ha-l-habilih$_2$ safar*
brother   Laila   she   said.*3sf*   that   he   /   the-idiot   left.*3sm*
'The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.'

⇒ **Condition C with no island → 'reconstructed' reading**

(16)   (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.'

⇒ **BVA with adjunct island → no 'reconstructed' reading**

---

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

(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.'

⇒ **Condition C with ajunct island → no 'reconstructed' reading**

	No island	Strong island
Weak resumption	reconstruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)**	reconstruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$), **not with cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)**
Strong resumption	recontruction with BVA ($\sqrt{}$) and with Cond. C (*)	no recontruction with BVA (*) and with Cond. C ($\sqrt{}$)

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[7]:

(19) (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 sa$_2$ classe, tu es persuadé que chaque prof$_2$ **l'**a déchirée.*
       'The picture of his class, you are sure that each teacher tore **it**.'

(20) (a) *ṭalib-[ha]$_1$ l-kassoul ... [wala mʕallmih]$_1$ ... [$_{DP}$ -oh [$_{NP}$ ~~ṭalib-ha$_1$ l-kassoul~~]]*
       the bad student of her$_1$ ... no teacher$_1$ ... [$_{DP}$ her [$_{NP}$ ~~bad student of her$_1$~~]]

   (b) *la photo de sa$_2$ classe ... chaque prof$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ l' [$_{NP}$ ~~photo de sa$_2$ classe~~]]*
       the picture of his$_2$ class ... each teacher$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ it [$_{NP}$ ~~picture of his$_2$ class~~]]

⇒ 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) (a) *[ʔakhu   Laila$_1$]$_2$ pro$_1$ ziʕlat   laʔannuh l-mudiirah   tardat-uh$_2$*
         brother Laila   she   upset.*3sf* because the-principal expelled.*3sm*-Cl
         / -uh$_2$ hu$_2$
         / -uh$_2$ hu$_2$
         / Cl   he
         'The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.'

   (b) *Le crayon$_2$ de Laila$_1$, je suis persuadé qu'elle$_1$ l$_2$'a volé.*
       Lit. 'The pen of Laila, I'm sure that she stole it.'

(22) (a) *[ʔakhu Laila$_1$]$_2$ ... pro$_1$ ... [$_{DP}$ -oh$_2$]*
       the brother$_2$ of Laila$_1$ ... she$_1$ ... [$_{DP}$ him$_2$]

   (b) *le crayon$_1$ de Laila$_2$ ... elle$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ l$_1$']*
       the pen$_1$ of Laila$_2$ ... she$_2$ ... [$_{DP}$ it$_1$]

4.2   Strong resumptives: reconstruction through movement

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

(23) *Apparent resumption:*
     [$_{DP}$ ... pronoun$_1$ ...]$_2$ [$_{IP}$ ... QP$_1$ ...[$_{CP}$ ...[$_{DP}$ [$_{DP}$ ... ~~pronoun$_1$~~ ...]$_2$ RP$_2$]]]

---

[7]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)   John gave his paycheck to his mistress. Everybody else put it in the bank.
       John$_1$ gave his$_1$ paycheck to his mistress. Everybody$_2$ else put [$_{DP}$ it [$_{NP}$ ~~paycheck of him$_2$~~]] 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 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.

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 intevenes, 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) *[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
             hu$_2$ ġaʃ   b-l-mtiħan
             he   cheated.*3.sm* in-the-exam
             'Her bad student, we don't want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.'

       (b) **[ʔakhu Laila$_1$]$_2$ pro$_1$ galat   ʔinnu hu$_2$ / ha-l-habilih$_2$ safar*
             brother Laila   she said.*3sf* that   he / the-idiot   left.*3sm*
             'The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.'

(26)   *no reconstruction with BVA/Condition C in strong island context:*

       (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.'

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

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 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**?'

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

(28) (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)?'

      (c) *ʔaya   surah$_1$ il-uh$_2$ 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)?'

⇒ 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 JA[8]. 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).

---

[8]This 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.

(29)   (a) *Scope Reconstruction with 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) *No Scope Reconstruction with 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*

   (c) *Binding reconstruction with Resumption*
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*

$\Rightarrow$ 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.
   $\Rightarrow$ 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).

- Resumption forces interpetation of the copy as definite.

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

Comments Welcome!

References

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

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.

Elisabet Engdahl. *The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Swedish*. PhD thesis, University of Amherst, MA, 1980.

Nicolas Guilliot. A top-down analysis for reconstruction. *Lingua*, Special issue on Celtic languages, to appear.

Pauline Jacobson. Towards a variable-free semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 22: 117–184, 1999.

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.