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].  
       \( (\exists > \forall)(\forall > \exists) \)
   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.
   c. *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.

---

1The 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.)

Cite as: Elena Anagnostopoulou and Danny Fox, course materials for 24.952 Advanced Syntax, Spring 2007. MIT OpenCourseWare (http://ocw.mit.edu/), Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Downloaded on [DD Month YYYY].
(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 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(λx…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 to win the lottery.
    b.  Someone from New York seems to be very likely to win the lottery.
    c.  Many soldiers seem to be very likely to die in the battle.
The trapping effect (Lebeaux, Hornstein)

(12) a. [At least one soldier]₁ seems (to Napoleon) [t₁ to be likely to die in every battle].
    b. [At least one soldier]₁ seems to himself₁ [t₁ to be likely to die in every battle].
    c. [At least one soldier]₁ seems to his₁ commanders [t₁ to be likely to die in every battle].

(13) a. One soldier is expected (by Napoleon) [t to die in every battle].
    b. One soldier₁ is expected by his₁ commander [t₁ to die in every battle].

Variable Binding (Obviation of WCO, Engdahl)

(14) a. Which of his₁ students did every professor₁ talk to t?
    b. Which student of his₁ did no professor₁ talk to t?
    c. Which student of his₁ did you think every professor₁ talked to t?
    d. Which of his₁ students did you think no professor₁ talked to t?

(15) a. *Which of his₁ students t talked to every professor₁?
    b. *Which student of his₁ t talked to no professor₁?
    c. *Which student of his₁ did you think t talked to every professor₁?
    d. *Which of his₁ students did you think t talked to no professor₁?

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 John₁ made] did he₁ believe t?
    b. ??[Which argument that John₁ is a genius] did he₁ believe t?
    c. ?? [Whose evaluation of John₁] is he₁ 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) \([Qₜ \ldots r\text{-expression}₁\ldots]₂ \ldots \text{pronoun}₁ \ldots t₂\)

(8) **Scope Reconstruction feeds BT\(\text{(C)}\):** 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 his₁] seems to David₁ [t to be in the other room].
       \((∃>\text{seem}) (\text{seem} >∃)\)

       b. [A student of David’s₁] seems to him₁ [t to be in the other room].
          \((∃>\text{seem}) ??(\text{seem} >∃)\)

(20) a. For these issues to be clarified,
[Many more/new papers about his\textsubscript{1} philosophy] seem to Quine\textsubscript{1} [t to be needed].

a. #For these issues to be clarified,
[Many more/new papers about Quine’s\textsubscript{1} philosophy] seem to him\textsubscript{1} [t to be needed].

A-bar Movement

Lebeaux:

(21) a. [The papers that he\textsubscript{i} gave to Ms. Brown\textsubscript{j}]
every student\textsubscript{i} hoped [\text{CP } t' that she\textsubscript{j} will read t].

b. *[The papers that he\textsubscript{i} gave to Ms. Brown\textsubscript{j}]
she\textsubscript{j} hoped [\text{CP } t' that every student\textsubscript{i} will revise t].

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

(36) a. [Which (of the) paper(s) that he\textsubscript{i} wrote for Ms. Brown\textsubscript{j}]
did every student\textsubscript{i} ___ get her\textsubscript{j} ___ to grade?

b. *[Which (of the) paper(s) that he\textsubscript{i} wrote for Ms. Brown\textsubscript{j}]
did she\textsubscript{j} ___ get every student\textsubscript{i} ___ to revise?

c. [Which (of the) paper(s) that he\textsubscript{i} wrote for her\textsubscript{j}]
did Ms. Brown\textsubscript{j} ___ get every student\textsubscript{i} ___ to revise?

(22) [How many NP\textsubscript{1} \(\phi(t_1)\)]
How n: n many NP \(\lambda t \phi(t)\)

Heycock:

(18) a. [How many people from his\textsubscript{1} class]
is John\textsubscript{1} likely to meet?

b. [How many people from John’s\textsubscript{1} class]
is he\textsubscript{1} likely to meet?

(18) a. #[How many papers that John\textsubscript{1} writes]
does he\textsubscript{1} think t will be published?

b. [How many papers that John\textsubscript{1} wrote]
does he\textsubscript{1} think t will be published?
(21)  

a.  *How many people from Diana's$_1$ neighborhood does she$_1$ think there are $t$ at the party?

b.  How many people from Diana's$_1$ neighborhood does she$_1$ think $t$ are at the party?

c.  How many people from her$_1$ neighborhood does Diana$_1$ think there are $t$ at the party?