Overt Movement even with Island Resumptives and Consequences

Background: Resumptive constructions compare with movement constructions as in (the pseudo for illustrative purposes) English below, where X can be an island or not:

(1)   The man who … [x … you saw a picture of <gap>]   (* if X is an island)

(2)   The man who … [x … you saw a picture of him]   (non standard if X not an island)

There are many specific issues that a theory of resumption must address but it should at least answer four basic general questions (see Mc Closkey's 2006 overview): **(i)** Why do resumptive constructions often coexist with movement constructions (albeit they are sometimes seen as last resort – e.g. in islands - or substandard)? **(ii)** What accounts for the syntactic or semantic similarities and differences between them? **(iii)** Why are the resumptive pronouns (RP) used always regular pronouns, never special forms? **(iv)** What mechanisms generate (here left) peripheral phrases (here *who* or the promoted head of the relative)?

Because some resumptive constructions seem immune to movement constraints, it is universally assumed that such constructions cannot always involve overt movement (see Rouveret, 2011 for a recent extensive survey) with some drawbacks, e.g. uneconomically requiring two distinct mechanisms (both first merge and remerge) to generate left peripheral phrases (e.g. *who* in (1)/(2)).

Proposal: I will propose that such resumptive constructions always involve **overt** movement, but, this is the crucial assumption, not necessarily from the <gap> or RP position. Instead, movement can be from a (possibly base generated) position doubled by and not necessarily adjacent to a pronoun, as e.g. a Clitic Left Dislocated position (CLLD, see Iatridou, 1995, showing CLLD phrases movability), or Contrastive Left Dislocation.

Arguments: The arguments that follows show that long distance (left) peripheral phrases can always show movement properties, hence must, by parsimony. First, Demirdache and Percus 2011 convincingly argue (on the basis of Jordanian Arabic) that the null hypothesis is that resumptive structures are created by movement (as they involve binding of the resumptive) and further demonstrate that they display expected WCO or SCO effects. They conclude that **covert** movement to the periphery is always involved (of a pronoun or null element). This however requires the two distinct options (merge and remerge) mentioned re question (iv). Furthermore, while Aoun et al. 2001 show (in Lebanese Arabic) that preposed phrases can reconstruct when the RP's position is accessible to movement, it is also possible to show that preposed phrases can reconstruct **even when the RP is inside an island**, although reconstruction cannot be to inside the island (avoiding the Guillot et al. 2007 confound). Thus consider ("substandard") French relatives with RPs:

(3)a.   **la photo de fiançailles$_k$** que Jean pense que si **son$_k$** auteur vient, on est foutus

    the engagement picture that John thinks that if its author comes, we are doomed.

   b.   **la photo de fiançailles$_k$** qu'on est foutus si Jean pense que **son$_k$** auteur vient

    the engagement picture that we are doomed if John thinks that its author comes.

In (3a), *the engagement picture* can be interpreted *de dicto* (John thinks there is such a picture but in fact there aren't any), if some position in the scope of *think* could have been moved from, to which the CLLD element could totally reconstruct (as required for this reading). In (3b), *think* is an island and the *de dicto* reading is excluded. Variable binding shows the same pattern:

(4)a. [**la photo de lui$_k$**]$_m$ que j'ai dit à **aucun accusé$_k$** que si **son$_m$** auteur vient, on est foutus

    *[His$_k$ picture]$_m$ that I told **noone$_k$** accused that if **its$_m$** author comes, we are doomed*

   b. [**la photo de lui$_{*k}$**]$_m$ qu'on est foutus si j'ai dit à **aucun accusé$_k$** que **son$_m$** auteur vient

    *[His$_{*k}$ picture]$_m$, that we are doomed if I told **noone$_k$** accused that **its$_m$** author is coming*

the bound pronoun must be able to be fully in the scope of its binder *aucun accusé* at LF which is possible in (4a) but not in (4b) as there is no position which could have been moved from in the scope of *aucun accusé* to which its container can reconstruct. The (3a/b) and (4a/b) contrasts thus illustrates islands sensitivity and shows that

overt movement of a peripheral phrase can be involved in both (3a) and (4a) regardless of whether the RP is movement accessible.

Analysis: Movement there is. Where movement is from can also be decided by using the *de re/de dicto* distinction. As Doron 2011 notes (for Hebrew relatives), an RP forces a *de re* reading in simple cases (5a). But in more complex cases, an intermediate *de dicto* reading is possible:

(5) **La photo de fiançaille$_m$** que **a.** (**b.** Pierre pense que) Jean **la$_m$** cherche

The engagement picture that (Peter thinks) John is looking for it)

In an extensional context, (5a) (without *Peter thinks*) must be about an actual engagement picture, while (5b) allows a reading in which Pierre mistakenly thinks such a picture exists. This *de dicto* reading requires total reconstruction, hence movement has taken place from a position higher than *chercher* but lower than *penser*. We conclude that it took place from a position at the periphery of the embedded clause, linked to a pronoun (the RP) in the embedded clause: a left peripheral Dislocated Position **DL**. Making this conclusion fully general, RP constructions are movement constructions except for the fact that extraction takes place from some Dislocated position **DL** binding the RP (the presence of the RP making DL a CLLD-like position):

$$\text{Step2} \qquad\qquad \text{Step 1 (\textbf{not necessarily movement})}$$

(6) $\boxed{DP_k} \leftarrow$ **Movement.** $\leftarrow$ [$_{DL}$ $\boxed{DP_k}$]$\leftarrow$ Dislocated Position$\rightarrow$ $\boxed{RP_k}$

The answers to questions **i-iv** follow. To **(i)**: because it is movement too, albeit on top of CLLD; to **(iii)** because CLLD uses normal pronouns; to **(iv)** normal movement in both and to **(ii)**: similar except for the syntactic and semantic effects of the intermediate **DL** step.

Illustrations of this double step overt movement approach can be given by Extraction in Selayarese which Finer, 1997 argues has the structure in (6). (6) can straightforwardly be extended to cover Resumption in Hebrew Relatives (Sichel, to appear), which now can, as RP relatives in general be analyzed as involved promotion (Kayne, 1994); the famous aN/aL complementizer distribution in Irish (Mc Closkey, 2001) (aN diagnosing Dislocation, aL movement); or

Consequences: The study of resumptive constructions now becomes in part the study of where this **DL** position can be (and the reason why Aoun et al. fail to find reconstruction effects with RP inside islands is that they consistently choose structures disallowing plausible intermediate DL positions) and what interpretation is associated with it. <u>Re where DL is</u>, the complexity of reconstruction facts can now be attributed to the fact that there may be different possibilities for the DL position. Thus, that variable binding or *de dicto* reading are available shows that some DL position is available "low" enough, while the failure of (reconstructed) Condition C effects shows that some "high" enough DL position is available (too). Similarly, as Demirdache and Percus discuss, when WCO or SCO effects are observed, the highest DL source position must be low enough, while the absence of such effects triggered within islands is due to the fact that the DL extraction site must be island external (as they themselves conclude). <u>Re DL's interpretation</u>, in connection with question (iv), the facts that CLLD constituents must be read as contrastive topics (see e.g. Arregi 2003) implies that they belong to a discourse prominent set of alternatives, hence must be "D-linked". This suggests that **(a)** all D-linked movement cases involve extraction from a contrastive DL peripheral position strongly recalling Cresti's 1995 approach to islands. Beyond such cases, it suggests that **(b)** no genuine successive cyclic movement exists. Instead, each intermediate step is a case of DL (which may be Topic as in CLLD with RP, or Focus with gaps), with concommittent semantics. We will discuss these two extensions if time permits.

<u>Abbr. References</u>: **Aoun** et al. 2001. Resumption, Movement, and Derivational Economy, LI. **Arregi**. 2003. Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization. Penn Working Papers. **Cresti**, 1995. Extraction and reconstruction. **Demirdache** et al. 2011. Resumptives, movement and interpretation, in Rouveret 2011. **Doron**. 2011. On the syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns, in Rouveret 2011. **Guilliot et al.** 2007. Reconstruction without movement. Coreference, Modality and Focus. John Benjamins **Iatridou**. 1995. Clitics and Island Effects. Penn Working Papers. Kayne. 1994. Antisymmetry of Syntax. **Mc Closkey**. 2002. Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, etc.. **Mc Closkey** 2006. Resumption, Syncom. **Rouveret**. 2011. Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces. John Benjamins. **Sichel**. to appear. Resumptive Pronouns and Competition. LI.