

## Reconstruction

### 1. Movement can have effects on Interpretation (Scope, Variable Binding, BT)

Katz Postal hypothesis: Interpretation is determined at D-Structure

However, beginning with *Syntactic Structures* there has been accumulating evidence against this hypothesis (we've already seen some evidence).

#### 1.1 Variable Binding and Scope

- (1) a. John seems to a (#different) teacher [ t to be likely to solve every one of these problems].  
 $(\exists > \forall) *(\forall > \exists)^1$   
 b. [Every one of these problems] seems to a (different) teacher [ t to be likely t to be solved t by John.  
 $(\exists > \forall)(\forall > \exists)$
- (2) a. ??his mother loves every boy.  
 b. Every boy is loved by his mother.
- (3) a. \*It is expected by his mother that every boy would be home on time.  
 b. Every boy is expected by his mother t to be home on time.  
 b. \*This problem seems to his mother t to be likely to be solved by every boy.  
 c. Every boy seems to his mother t to be likely to solve this problem.

#### 1.2. Binding Theory

Condition A:

- (4) a. \*It seems to himself that John would solve the problem.  
 b. \*The problem seems to himself t to have been solved by John.  
 c. John seems to himself to have solved the problem.

---

<sup>1</sup>The impossibility of wide scope for the universal quantifier can be seen by the ungrammaticality of (1a) when *different* receives a bound interpretation as in *a different guard is standing on top of every building*. We can further demonstrate the impossibility of the  $(\forall > \exists)$  scope relation by considering cases in which the alternative scope relation results in an interpretation which is cognitively anomalous, e.g.: # *This soldier seems to someone to be likely to die in every battle*. or # *The ball seems to a boy to be under every shell*. (c.f. *Every shell seems to a (different) boy to be over the ball*.)

- (5) a. \*John expects Bill to praise himself.  
b. John expects himself to be praised.
- (6) a. I told John whether/that Mary bought a picture of himself.  
b. I told John which picture of himself Mary bought.

Condition B:

- (7) a. John wants it to seem to everyone that he has solved the problem.  
b. John wants the problem to seem to everyone to have been solved by him.  
c. \*John wants him to seem to everyone to have solved the problem.

Condition C:

- (8) a. \*It is expected by him that a picture of John would be on sale.  
d. A picture of John is expected by him t to be on sale.
- (9) a. \*He bought a picture that John saw.  
b. Which picture that John saw did he buy?

A Possible Conclusion: the base position of an element is where a theta role is determined but other (interpretive) properties are determined at the landing site. (Scope, Binding Theory)

A certain semantic procedure suggests itself, along with the postulation of QR, to which we will return.

- (10) YP...t...  
YP( $\lambda x...$ x...)

## 2. Movement need not have effects on interpretation

### 2.1. Scope (and Variable Binding) Reconstruction

A-Movement

- (11) a. Someone from New York is very likely t to win the lottery.  
b. Someone from New York seems t to be very likely t' to win the lottery.  
c. Many soldiers seem t to be very likely t' to die in the battle.

The trapping effect (Lebeaux, Hornstein)

- (12) a. [At least one soldier]<sub>1</sub> seems (to Napoleon) [t<sub>1</sub> to be likely to die in every battle].  
 b. [At least one soldier]<sub>1</sub> seems to himself<sub>1</sub> [t<sub>1</sub> to be likely to die in every battle].  
 c. [At least one soldier]<sub>1</sub> seems to his<sub>1</sub> commanders [t<sub>1</sub> to be likely to die in every battle].
- (13) a. One soldier is expected (by Napoleon) [t to die in every battle].  
 b. One soldier<sub>1</sub> is expected by his<sub>1</sub> commander [t<sub>1</sub> to die in every battle].

Variable Binding (Obviation of WCO, Engdahl)

- (14) a. Which of his<sub>1</sub> students did every professor<sub>1</sub> talk to t?  
 b. Which student of his<sub>1</sub> did no professor<sub>1</sub> talk to t?  
 c. Which student of his<sub>1</sub> did you think every professor<sub>1</sub> talked to t?  
 d. Which of his<sub>1</sub> students did you think no professor<sub>1</sub> talked to t?
- (15) a. \*Which of his<sub>1</sub> students t talked to every professor<sub>1</sub>?  
 b. \*Which student of his<sub>1</sub> t talked to no professor<sub>1</sub>?  
 c. \*Which student of his<sub>1</sub> did you think t talked to every professor<sub>1</sub>?  
 d. \*Which of his<sub>1</sub> students did you think t talked to no professor<sub>1</sub>?

### 2.1.1. BT Reconstruction

Condition A:

- (16) a. Pictures of himself seem to John [t to be available]  
 b. Friends of each other are expected by John and Mary [t to arrive on time]  
 c. ??[Friends of each other] promised John and Mary [PRO to arrive on time]
- (17) a. Which picture of himself did Mary say that John likes t?  
 b. Which of each others friends did Mary tell you that John and Fred like t?  
 b. \*Which of each others friends did Mary tell t that John and Fred like you?

Condition C:

Riemsdijk and Williams, Freidin, Lebeaux:

- (18) a. [Which argument that John<sub>1</sub> made] did he<sub>1</sub> believe t?  
 b. ??[Which argument that John<sub>1</sub> is a genius] did he<sub>1</sub> believe t?  
 c. ?? [Whose evaluation of John<sub>1</sub>] is he<sub>1</sub> proud of t  
 (cf. *Whose evaluation of him is John proud of*)

The facts with Condition C are interesting since (in contrast to anything else we've seen up to now) they involve obligatory reconstruction.

Something to think about: Are there cases of reconstruction for condition B. If not, why not?

### 3. The Relationship between Scope Reconstruction and BT Reconstruction

Scope Reconstruction seems to be possible in many cases. The same is true of BT reconstruction. The question is, do they correlate?

#### 3.1. Condition C and Scope Reconstruction

Do we get the following correlation?

- (7) [QP ...r-expression<sub>1</sub>...]<sub>2</sub>.....pronoun<sub>1</sub>....t<sub>2</sub>
- (8) **Scope Reconstruction feeds BT(C):** Scope Reconstruction should be impossible in the structural configuration in (7).

#### A Movement (Fox, Romero, Sportiche)

These judgments are reported in the literature, but the judgment in class did not confirm the prediction:

- (19) a. [A student of his<sub>1</sub>] seems to David<sub>1</sub> [t to be in the other room].  
 (∃>seem) (seem >∃)
- b. [A student of David's<sub>1</sub>] seems to him<sub>1</sub> [t to be in the other room].  
 (∃>seem) ??(seem >∃)
- (20) a. For these issues to be clarified,

[Many more/new papers about his<sub>1</sub> philosophy] seem to Quine<sub>1</sub> [t to be needed].

- a. #For these issues to be clarified,  
[Many more/new papers about Quine's<sub>1</sub> philosophy] seem to him<sub>1</sub> [t to be needed].

### A-bar Movement

Lebeaux:

- (21) a. [The papers that he<sub>i</sub> gave to Ms. Brown<sub>j</sub>]  
every student<sub>i</sub> hoped [<sub>CP</sub> t' that she<sub>j</sub> will read t].  
b. \*[The papers that he<sub>i</sub> gave to Ms. Brown<sub>j</sub>]  
she<sub>j</sub> hoped [<sub>CP</sub> t' that every student<sub>i</sub> will revise t].

A variation on Lebeaux which relies on (argues for) VP adjunction (Fox):

- (36) a. [Which (of the) paper(s) that he<sub>i</sub> wrote for Ms. Brown<sub>j</sub>]  
did every student<sub>i</sub> \_\_\_ get her<sub>j</sub> \_\_\_\* to grade?  
b. \*[Which (of the) paper(s) that he<sub>i</sub> wrote for Ms. Brown<sub>j</sub>]  
did she<sub>j</sub> \_\_\_\* get every student<sub>i</sub> \_\_\_\* to revise?  
c. [Which (of the) paper(s) that he<sub>i</sub> wrote for her<sub>j</sub>]  
did Ms. Brown<sub>j</sub> \_\_\_\* get every student<sub>i</sub> \_\_\_\* to revise?

- (22) [How many NP]<sub>1</sub> φ(t<sub>1</sub>)  
How n: n many NP λt φ(t)

Heycock:

- (18) a. [How many people from his<sub>1</sub> class]  
is John<sub>1</sub> likely to meet?  
b. [How many people from John's<sub>1</sub> class]  
is he<sub>1</sub> likely to meet?
- (18) a. #[How many papers that John<sub>1</sub> writes]  
does he<sub>1</sub> think t will be published?  
b. [How many papers that John<sub>1</sub> wrote]  
does he<sub>1</sub> think t will be published?

- (21) a. \*How many people from Diana's<sub>1</sub> neighborhood does she<sub>1</sub> think there are t at the party?  
b. How many people from Diana's<sub>1</sub> neighborhood does she<sub>1</sub> think t are at the party?  
c. How many people from her<sub>1</sub> neighborhood does Diana<sub>1</sub> think there are t at the party?