

When Resumption Determines Reconstruction

Nicolas Guilliot and Nouman Malkawi¹
University of NANTES–LLING

1 Introduction

Traditional accounts of reconstruction, a well-known phenomenon by which displaced constituents are (partly) interpreted in their original site, mostly rely on the following claim and analysis: *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). From this assumption, the aim of our paper is twofold. Firstly, we present novel data from French and Jordanian Arabic involving resumption that clearly argue for reconstruction within strong islands, hence casting doubt on the traditional generalization. Secondly, we propose to modify the traditional analysis about reconstruction in the following way: *if an XP allows for reconstruction, a copy of that XP (rather than movement of that XP) should be present*. More precisely, we argue that unexpected cases of reconstruction within strong islands just follow from the **NP-deletion's analysis** of pronouns (see Elbourne (2001)) applied to resumption.

2 What is Reconstruction?

Reconstruction concerns the interaction between displacement (dislocation, topicalization, interrogation, relativization) and interpretation procedures such as binding conditions or scope, as examples in (1) show:

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

Both (1a) and (1b) can have a 'reconstructed' functional reading. (1a) is often viewed as a case of binding reconstruction, as the intended 'reconstructed' reading mapping a different *picture* for *each man* can be obtained through interpretation of the pronoun *him* as a variable bound by the quantifier. Contrastingly, (1b) is referred to as a case of scope reconstruction, as the functional reading (a different *patient* for *every doctor*) now follows from a kind of narrow scope of *patient* with respect to *each doctor*.

2.1 Copy theory of movement

In the generative and minimalist framework, these data are accounted for through the copy theory of movement, a syntactic mechanism given by Lebeaux (1990), Bianchi (1995), Sauerland (2004) among others, to allow interpretation of a displaced constituent in its base position:

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

Presence of a copy in (2a) accounts for the functional reading, as the quantifier *c*-commands the pronoun *him* within the copy, hence allowing for its bound variable interpretation. The case of (2b) is also straightforward if we assume that copies can be interpreted as indefinite, as claimed by Kayne (1994) for relative clauses and by Bautista (2001) for *wh*-structures. Following Kratzer (1998)'s analysis of

¹We would like to thank, for their help or comments, Ronnie Cann, Hamida Demirdache (Phd supervisor), Anamaria Falas, Danny Fox, Ruth Kempson, Guiseppe Longobardi, Magda Oiry, Orin Percus, Dafina Ratiu, Maribel Romero, Alain Rouveret, Uli Sauerland, and Karen Zagana.

E-mail addresses: nico.guilliot@gmail.com, malkawi72m@yahoo.fr

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

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

indefinites, we propose that a copy can then be interpreted as a skolemized choice function, which takes two arguments, one individual x and a set of entities P and returns one individual of that set (written $f_x(P)$). Interpretation of the copy in (2b) as indefinite gives rise to the following partial LF where the function is bound by the quantifier, hence predicting the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading mapping every doctor to a different patient³:

- (3) *Partial LF of (2b):* $\lambda p.\exists f. true(p)\wedge p=every\ doctor_x\ examined\ f_x(patient)$

Traditional account of reconstruction then argues for the following generalization: *if an XP allows for reconstruction, movement of that XP has occurred.*

2.2 What about Resumption?

Resumption is a linguistic phenomenon in which a pronoun occupies a site where a gap (A’ trace) would normally be expected. A major property of resumption noticed by Aoun et al. (2001) is the fact that it sometimes allows for reconstruction, as the following contrast with dislocation structures in Lebanese Arabic shows:

- (4) (a) $[t\partial lmiiz-a_1\ l-k\partial sleen]_2\ ma\ baddna\ n\chi abbir\ wala\ m\gamma allme_1\ ?\partial nno\ huww_e_2$
 student-her the-bad Neg want-1p tell-1p no teacher that he
za’ibar
 cheated-3sm
 ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we don’t want to tell any teacher₁ that he₂ cheated.’
- (b) $*[t\partial lmiiz-a_1\ l-k\partial sleen]_2\ ma\ hkiina\ ma\gamma wala\ m\gamma allme_1\ ?able-ma\ huww_e_2$
 student-her the-bad Neg talked-1p with no teacher before he
yuusal
 arrive-3sm
 ‘Her₁ bad student₂, we didn’t talk to any teacher₁ before he₂ arrived.’

If there is no syntactic island⁴ as in (4a), the functional reading (a different *student* for *each teacher*) is allowed, suggesting a kind of (binding) reconstruction of the displaced constituent in the site occupied by the strong resumptive pronoun *huww_e*. Contrastingly, presence of an island (see the adjunct island in (4b)) bans this reading⁵.

To account for this contrast, Aoun et al. (2001) propose a distinction between apparent resumption when no island intervenes, and true resumption in presence of an island, and further claim that only the former can be derived with movement, as the following schemas show (RE stands for Resumptive Element):

- (5) *Apparent resumption:*
 $[DP \dots pronoun_1 \dots]_2 [IP \dots QP_1 \dots [CP \dots [DP [DP \dots pronoun_1 \dots] RE_2]]]$
- (6) *True resumption:*
 $[DP \dots pronoun_{*1} \dots]_2 [IP \dots QP_1 \dots [Island \dots [DP RE_2]]]$

The contrast in (4) is now predicted. Interpretation of the copy in (4a) gives rise to the functional reading (through the bound pronoun -a ‘her’), whereas no copy is available in (4b).

To summarize, Aoun et al. (2001) just extend traditional analysis of reconstruction to resumption in the following way: *even with resumption, if an XP allows for reconstruction, movement that XP has occurred.*

³For 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 with respect to reconstruction (see section 6).

⁴Syntactic structures that ban (for strong islands) or restrict (for weak islands) any kind of movement. Notice that only strong islands such as adjuncts or complex-NP will be investigated here.

⁵Notice here that resumption in Lebanese Arabic can indeed circumvent islandhood, like in many other languages (French, Breton...): only the ‘reconstructed’ reading is unavailable in (4b).

3 The Paradox

Traditional accounts of reconstruction mostly capitalize on presence of syntactic movement: *be it via resumption or not, if an XP allows for reconstruction, movement of that XP has occurred*. This analysis then makes the following prediction:

(7) *Reconstruction of an XP should never occur within islands.*

However, consider the following dislocation structures from Jordanian Arabic (henceforth, JA) in (8) and French in (9), and *wh*- structure from French in (10). All these examples involve resumption (clitic or doubled clitic) within a strong island (adjunct):

(8) [ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma ziʔlat [wala mʕalmih]₁ laʔannuh l-mudiirah
 student-her the-bad Neg upset.3sf no teacher because the-principal
 kaḥʕat-uh₂ / -uh₂ hu₂ mn l-madrase
 expelled.3sf-CL / CL he from the-school

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

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

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

Unexpectedly, all the examples in (8), (9) and (10) can have a ‘reconstructed’ functional reading. (8) clearly allows for a strict mapping between teachers and pictures, suggesting binding reconstruction in the site occupied by the resumptive clitic *-uh* ‘him’ (the possessive *-ha* ‘her’ being interpreted as a bound variable). The same goes for (9). Finally, the *wh*- structure in (10) also clearly allows for the functional reading, as it can give rise to a functional answer like *la photo de lui à son mariage* (‘the picture of him at his wedding’).

The paradox is then the following: 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?**

4 What really matters for Reconstruction?

Before turning to our proposal, we first show that presence vs absence of reconstruction (at least in JA) depends descriptively on two crucial parameters⁶: the type of resumption, and the type of binding condition.

4.1 The type of resumption: weak vs strong

The distinction between strong resumption (strong pronoun or epithet) and weak resumption (clitic and doubled clitic) plays an important role in allowing or banning reconstruction, and this only **within strong islands**, as the contrast in (11) shows:

(11) (a) [ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul]₂ ma ḥakjan maʕ [wala mʕalmih]₁ gabl-ma tʕuf-uh₂
 student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before saw.3sf-Cl
 / -uh₂ hu₂ l-mudiirah
 / -Cl he the-principal.3sf

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

⁶Obviously, 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.

- (b) * $[\text{ʔalib-}[\text{ha}]_1 \text{ l-kassul}]_2 \text{ ma } \text{ħakjan} \text{ ma} \text{ʔ} [\text{wala } m\text{ʕalmih}]_1 \text{ gabl-ma } \text{hu}_2 /$
 student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before he /
 $\text{ha-l-} \text{ġabi}_2 \text{ yesal}$
 the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’

Within strong islands (adjunct island in (11)), **weak** resumptives (see the clitic or doubled clitic in (11a)) **allow** for the ‘reconstructed’ functional reading (meaning that the bound variable interpretation of *-ha* ‘her’ is available), whereas **strong** resumptives (see the strong pronoun or epithet in (11b)) **ban** this reading⁷.

4.2 The type of binding condition: positive vs negative

The type of binding condition is equally essential to determine presence or absence of reconstruction, but this only **with weak resumption**. As shown by (11a) from section 4.1, weak resumption allows for reconstruction within islands with variable binding (henceforth, BVA, for Bound Variable Anaphora)⁸. However, notice that, within the same environment, reconstruction is not present anymore when condition C, rather than BVA, is at stake. Indeed, consider (12), which is perfectly grammatical under the intended reading where the embedded subject refers to *Laila*:

- (12) $[\text{ʔakhu } \text{Laila}_1]_2 \text{ pro}_1 \text{ zi} \text{ʕlat} \text{ la} \text{ʔannuh} \text{ l-mudiirah} \text{ tardat-uh}_2$
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl
 ‘The brother of Laila, she got upset because the principal expelled him.’

(12) clearly argues for the absence of reconstruction, as reconstruction of the displaced constituent would create a condition C violation (*Laila* being bound by the embedded subject). Notice that this contrast between a positive binding condition (BVA) and a negative one (condition C) can be generalized to contexts where no island intervenes, as shown by the similar contrast in (13). The grammaticality of (13a) under the intended reading (bound variable interpretation) argues for the presence of reconstruction, whereas the grammaticality of (13b) argues for its absence.

- (13) (a) $[\text{ʔalib-}[\text{ha}]_1 \text{ l-kassul}]_2 \text{ ma } \text{beddna} \text{ ngol} [\text{l-wala } m\text{ʕalmih}]_1 \text{ ʔenno } \text{l-mudiirah}$
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that the-principal
 $\text{tardat-uh}_2 \text{ mn } \text{l-madrased}$
 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) $\text{ʕalamit}_2 \text{ Karim}_1, \text{ bitfakir } \text{ʔinnu} \text{ pro}_1 \text{ lazim } \text{ʔi} \text{ġayyar-ha}_2.$
 grade Karim think.2sm that he must change-it
 ‘Karim’s grade, you think that he must change it.’

Also notice that strong resumption does not exhibit this contrast, as positive and negative binding conditions follow exactly the same pattern: reconstruction is present with any binding condition when no island intervenes, as shown by (14), whereas no reconstruction (with any binding condition) holds when a strong island (adjunct island) intervenes, as (15) shows:

- (14) (a) $[\text{ʔalib-}[\text{ha}]_1 \text{ l-kassul}]_2 \text{ ma } \text{beddna} \text{ ngol} [\text{l-wala } m\text{ʕalmih}]_1 \text{ ʔenno } \text{hu}_2$
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that he
 ġaf
 cheated.3sm in-the-exam
 ‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’

⁷(11) is exactly parallel to (4b) given by Aoun et al. (2001) for Lebanese Arabic.

⁸Notice that Condition A unsurprisingly behaves strictly in parallel to BVA, as both conditions are positive binding conditions, i.e. licensing conditions.

- (b) * $[\text{?akhu Laila}_1]_2$ pro_1 *galat* ?innu hu_2 / *ha-l-habilih}_2* *safar*
 brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’
- (15) (a) * $[\text{?alib-[ha]}_1$ *l-kassul}_2* *ma* *ħakjan* *maʕ* $[\text{wala mʕalmih}]_1$ *gabl-ma hu}_2 /
 student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before he /
ha-l-ġabi}_2 *yesal*
 the-idiot.3sm arrive.3sm
 ‘Her bad student, we didn’t talk to any teacher before he / this idiot arrived.’*
- (b) $[\text{?akhu Laila}_1]_2$ pro_1 *ziʕlat* *laʕannuh 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.’*

In (14), presence of reconstruction gives rise to satisfaction of BVA in (a) and condition C violation in (b), whereas in (15), absence of reconstruction gives rise to BVA violation in (a) and satisfaction of condition C in (b).

4.3 Summary

The crucial parameters that govern presence versus absence of reconstruction are summarized in the following table:

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

Table 1. Reconstruction wrt resumption, islandhood & binding conditions

This table leads to the following generalization: reconstruction with weak resumption is sensitive to the type of binding condition, but insensitive to islandhood (available even in strong islands), whereas reconstruction with strong resumption is sensitive to islandhood (present in no or weak island contexts, but absent in strong island contexts), but insensitive to the type of binding condition. In what follows, we will offer a straightforward account for these puzzling generalizations on weak and strong resumption.

5 The proposal: two kinds of Reconstruction

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

- (16) *Reconstruction of an XP follows from interpretation of a copy of that XP.*

Notice here that the existence of copies originates from two distinct processes: movement, or ellipsis. Building on this distinction, we then argue that reconstruction with weak resumption follows from ellipsis via NP-deletion’s analysis of resumptive pronouns (see Elbourne (2001) among others), whereas reconstruction with strong resumption is based on movement when available (along the lines of Aoun et al. (2001)).

5.1 Weak resumptives as definite determiners

Elbourne (2001) among others assimilates third person pronouns to definite determiners. He further assumes two possible structures for them, corresponding to two different anaphoric processes:

- (17) (a) $[_{DP} [_D \text{the/it}] \text{NP}]$
 (b) $[_{DP} \text{the/it } 1]$

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

To account for reconstruction data with weak resumption, we basically generalize Elbourne (2001)'s treatment of pronouns to weak resumptives. Added to our principle in (16), this proposal nicely accounts for widely unexpected data with respect to reconstruction with weak resumption, and more precisely the fact that it is insensitive to islandhood (always available with BVA), but sensitive to the type of binding condition (available with BVA, but absent with condition C).

Reconstruction with weak resumption is available even within strong islands (recall examples in (8), (9), (10) and (11)) as it follows from ellipsis, and not movement. Take (8) for example, repeated here in (18a).

- (18) (a) [*ʔalib-[ha]*₁ *l-kassul*]₂ *ma ziʔlat wala mʕalmih₁ laʔannuh l-mudiirah*
 student-her the-bad Neg upset-3sf no teacher because the-principal
kaḥfat-uh₂ mn l-madrase
 expelled-3sf-CL from the-school

"Her₁ bad student, no teacher₁ was upset because the principal expelled him from school."

- (b) \Rightarrow [_{DP} *ʔalib-[ha]*₁ *l-kassul*]₂ ... [*wala mʕalmih*]₁ ... [_{DP} *-uh* [*ʔalib-ha*₁ *l-kassul*]]₂

NP-deletion's analysis of weak resumptive *-uh* gives rise to the schema in (18b), hence predicting the availability of the 'reconstructed' reading.

Sensitivity to binding conditions with weak resumption is also predicted. Reconstruction with BVA is straightforwardly predicted by the schema in (18b): presence of the elided copy allows for the bound variable interpretation of *-ha*. But recall from, repeated here in (19a), that no reconstruction appears with weak resumption when condition C is at stake, as coreference between *Laila* and the embedded subject is available. The account is also straightforward if we assume that weak resumptives can also be analysed with an index as argument (see the structure in (17b)), giving rise the schema in (19b): the absence of any copy predicts the absence of condition C violation.

- (19) (a) [*ʔakhu Laila*]₁₂ *pro₁ ziʔlat laʔannuh l-mudiirah tardat-uh₂ / -uh₂*
 brother Laila she upset.3sf because the-principal expelled.3sm-Cl / Cl
hu₂
 he

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

- (b) [*ʔakhu Laila*]₁₂ ... *pro₁ ...* [_{DP} [*-uh*]]₂]
 the brother₂ of Laila₁ ... she₁ ... [_{DP} [him]]₂]

To summarize, we argue that weak resumptives can be interpreted in the same way as definite determiners. Presence of a bound pronoun within the elided copy will give rise to the covariant reading of the weak resumptive.

5.2 Strong resumptives: reconstruction through movement

Recall that reconstruction with strong resumption, in contrast to reconstruction with weak resumption, is sensitive to islandhood (present in no-island contexts, but absent in strong island contexts), but insensitive to the type of binding condition. To account for these properties, we propose that Aoun et al. (2001)'s distinction between apparent and true resumption should be preserved, but only for strong resumption. A natural question is then: why should it be restricted in that way? Recall that Aoun et al. (2001)'s structure for apparent resumption, repeated here in (20) crucially relies on an adjunction structure between the copy of the moved constituent and any resumptive element (RE), be it weak or strong:

- (20) *Apparent resumption:*
 [_{DP} ... *pronoun₁* ...]₂ [_{IP} ... *QP₁* ... [_{CP} ... [_{DP} [_{DP} ... *pronoun₁* ...]₂ *RE₂*]]]

But, as pointed out by (Elbourne, 2001, chap.3), weak pronouns cannot be cliticized onto DPs in the surface, as (21a) shows, whereas both strong pronouns in (21b) and epithets in (21c) can appear overtly adjoined (be used in apposition) to a DP:

- (21) (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.’

Now, our proposal to restrict Aoun et al. (2001)’s analysis to strong resumption comes as no surprise, as only strong pronouns and epithets can be adjoined to a DP. Furthermore, this claim nicely accounts for the fact that reconstruction with strong resumption is sensitive to islandhood (available only when no island intervenes), but insensitive to binding conditions. Consider again the contrast between no-island contexts in (22) and strong island contexts in (23):

- (22) (a) [*ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul*]₂ *ma beddna ngol [l-wala mʕalmih]₁ ʔenno hu₂*
 student-her the-bad Neg want.1pl say to-no teacher that he
ǰaf b-l-mtiħan
 cheated.3.sm in-the-exam
 ‘Her bad student, we don’t want to tell any teacher that he cheated in the exam.’
- (b) **[ʔakhu Laila₁]₂ pro₁ galat ʔinnu hu₂ / ha-l-habilih₂ safar*
 brother Laila she said.3sf that he / the-idiot left.3sm
 ‘The brother of Laila, she said that he/the idiot left.’
- (23) (a) **[ʔalib-[ha]₁ l-kassul*]₂ *ma ħakjan maʕ [wala mʕalmih]₁ gabl-ma hu₂ /*
 student-her the-bad Neg talked.1pl with no teacher before he /
ha-l-ǰabi₂ yesal
 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.’

Whenever movement is licit, as in (22), apparent resumption will be at stake. Creation of a copy adjoined to the strong resumptive then triggers reconstruction, hence satisfaction of BVA in (22a) and condition C violation of in (22b). On the contrary, strong island contexts in (23) ban reconstruction. Strong resumption will be derived as a case of true resumption (without any movement): the absence of any copy then triggers BVA violation in (23a), but satisfaction of condition C in (23b).

6 Further support: on copy interpretation

Further support for this approach comes from a closer study of functional questions such as in (1), and their interaction with resumption. Consider then the contrast both from French in (24) and Jordanian Arabic (JA) in (25):

- (24) (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 I₁’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 I₁’a déchirée?* (√funct.)
 ‘Which picture of him are you furious because each man tore it?’

- (25) (a) ?aya surah₁ kul zalamih maza $\dot{\gamma}$ ___₁? (\checkmark functional)
 Which picture every man tear.past
 ‘Which picture did each man tear?’
- (b) ? ?aya surah₁ kul zalamih maza $\dot{\gamma}$ -ha₁? (*functional)
 Which picture every man tear.past-Cl
 ‘Which picture did each man tear (it)?’
- (c) ?aya surah₁ il-uh₂ kul zalamih₂ maza $\dot{\gamma}$ -ha₁? (\checkmark functional)
 Which picture of-him every man tear.past-Cl
 ‘Which picture of him did each man tear (it)?’

The ‘reconstructed’ functional reading mapping a different *picture* for *each man* is available with a gap, as shown by (24a) and (25a). But surprisingly in (24b) and (25b), insertion of a resumptive element in the original site blocks the functional reading. The only reading available in these two examples is the individual one suggesting that each man tore the same picture⁹. And even more surprisingly, (24c) and (25c) show that the functional reading reappears with resumption when the displaced constituent contains a pronoun (*lui* in French, *-uh* in JA).

We argue that this complex contrast follows nicely from our account of reconstruction, and more precisely from the way copies get interpreted. Recall first from section 2 that we assume that a copy can be interpreted as indefinite, and more precisely as a skolemized choice function. This proposal accounts for cases of scope reconstruction such as the ones in (24a) and (25a), leading to the schema in (26):

- (26) quelle photo ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} [_{NP} photo]]
 ?aya surah ... kul zalamih₂ ... [_{DP} [_{NP} surah]]
 which picture ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} [_{NP} picture]]
 LF: $\lambda p.\exists f.true(p)\wedge p=each\ man_x\ tore\ f_x(picture)$

In (26), interpretation of the copy as a skolemized choice function (indefinite) gives rise to the functional reading mapping *each man* to a different *picture*.

To account for the fact that this reading is blocked when resumption is inserted, we just argue that resumption (as a definite description) forces a **definite** interpretation of the copy created either via movement or ellipsis (hence blocking interpretation of the copy as a skolemized choice function). The schema of (24b) and (25b) is given in (27):

- (27) quelle photo ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} I' [_{NP} photo]]
 ?aya surah ... kul zalamih₂ ... [_{DP} -ha [_{NP} surah]]
 which picture ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture]]
 LF: $\lambda p.\exists y.true(p)\wedge p=(you\ are\ furious\ because)\ each\ man_x\ tore\ the\ picture\ identical\ to\ y$

The absence of functional reading in these examples is not surprising anymore, as a definite description under the scope of quantifier does not give rise to any distributive reading, but only to the individual reading. Notice here that the absence of functional reading does not follow from absence of reconstruction per se (the bare-NP does indeed reconstruct), but rather the fact that the resulting copy has to be interpreted as definite.

Finally, notice that we also account for the fact that the functional reading reappears with resumption if a pronoun is inserted in the displaced constituent, as shown by (24c) and (25c). This is predicted under our account, as it leads to the schema in (28):

- (28) quelle photo de lui₂ ... chaque homme₂ ... [_{DP} I' [_{NP} photo-de-lui₂]]
 ?aya surah il-uh₂... kul zalamih₂ ... [_{DP} -ha [_{NP} surah-il-uh₂]]
 which picture of him₂ ... each man₂ ... [_{DP} it [_{NP} picture-of-him₂]]
 LF: $\lambda p.true(p)\wedge p=(you\ are\ furious\ because)\ each\ man_x\ tore\ the\ picture\ of\ x$

⁹This 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 and traces are treated on a par in these accounts.

Again, presence of resumption (as a definite description) blocks interpretation of the copy as indefinite. But the functional reading can still be obtained through the presence of the bound pronoun within the resulting copy, as a case of binding reconstruction.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we show that (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) when weak resumption is used. We then argue for a more fine-grained analysis of reconstruction, based on the following central claims:

- Reconstruction effect of an XP signals the presence of a copy of that XP;
- Reconstruction with weak resumption follows from ellipsis, and more precisely from NP deletion's analysis of pronouns given in Elbourne (2001);
- Reconstruction with strong resumption follows from A'-movement (see Aoun et al. (2001)), leading to apparent resumption when movement is available, and true resumption otherwise;
- 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).

References

- Joseph Aoun, Lina Choueiri, and Norbert 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.
- 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.

Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Donald Baumer,
David Montero, and Michael Scanlon

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2006

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2006 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-415-6 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Guilliot, Nicolas and Nouman Malkawi. 2006. When Resumption Determines Reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, 168-176. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Guilliot, Nicolas and Nouman Malkawi. 2006. When Resumption Determines Reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, 168-176. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1446.