

These is quick summary of the basic ideas found in the handouts representative of talks given in the past few years starting in 94-95 in UCLA seminars.¹ Needless to say the ideas have evolved over the years and are still evolving (One basic change is reliance of Locality of Selection instead of Strong UTAH).

The basic ideas:

Observation: There is reconstruction under A-movement but not always.

Proposal: Why? Because we are attempted to reconstruct elements that never moved from where we are trying to reconstruct them. (possible reconstruction is a necessary and sufficient property of movement dependencies).

Primary Fundamental Consequences:

i. VP-split: Larsonian VPs contain the accusative position lower than the VP internal subject position: Split VPs (as argued in Koopman and Sportiche 91 and Sportiche, 1990..).
Conceptually Why? because syntax is essentially decompositional

ii. D-split: D's Number and NP s are not generated as constituents. They are put together by movement rules.

Conceptually why? because syntactic organization is essentially layered and partitioned.

Theory

If (i) and (ii) are true empirically, why are they true theoretically?

Because selection is always expressed strictly locally in syntax (e.g. V's selects Ns not Number or Ds → V take NPs as arguments...).

[Movement is defined as non local selection]

Some Consequential Leading Ideas (mostly for D-splitting, Split VPs have to a certain extent been explored elsewhere, e.g. Sportiche, 1990, Koizumi, 1995 etc., von Stechow 1996 or indirectly Dowty 1979 and its antecedents, although there is of course more to say)

Ds (Number) and Adverbs are the same type of objects. Much like focus particles, they may associate with different XPs: when with NPs (or more precisely NumPs) they are known as Ds. Otherwise they are known as Adverbs. Thus there is no (deep) distinction between A(dverbial) Quantification and D(eterminer) quantification.

Number (singular, plural etc..) is similar, it always pluralizes events but may attribute this plurality to a plurality of participants (by associating to an NP).

Clitics (Romance type): they exist and show up high in the structure because they are basically D's in their normal position (what Sportiche 92 calls CliticPs).

Q-float: floated Qs are simply D/Adverb stranded by further movement of an associated NP, NumP or DPs (much like in Sportiche, Q-float 1988, and Subject clitics in French and Romance 1995).

There is a variety of Scrambling possibilities (at least two both for subjects and for objects).

NP to Num: this is movement for "Accusative Case" for objects, or for "Nominative Case for Subjects". This is A-movement.

¹Portions of this material was presented at UCLA I various seminars since 1994-95 in 96 at UCI, UdM, Rutgers, Upenn, at the international morphology conference in Vienna Austria in 97 in U of Vienna, at MIT, at the Groningen Going Romance conference, in 98 at MIT, at the University of Vienna, in 99 at UofVenezia, Uof Paris3, U of Firenze, U of Siena, GLOW Thermi Summer school, Thanks to all these audiences for their questions and comments.

Num+NP to D, this is scrambling for specificity, definiteness etc.. depending on the type of D. (This is Scrambling or Object Shift in Germanic or Hindi, Clitic "placement" in Romance etc..). Num+NP to WhD: this is wh-movement...

More generally, it is predicted that the hierarchy of DP internal positions (say various D > Number > N) is actually reflected in the order of positions that NPs/ NumPS /DPs can occupy at the clausal level.

More detail

My handout have two halves, one about D-splitting that I describe below, and one about "lexical decomposition" which strikes me, when properly construed as the only real possibility (I think it follows from the same general principles as D-splitting), but I ignore this here.

D-splitting

My starting point is reconstruction in A-movement cases.

1.

I assume that a theory of reconstruction should predict when it occurs, rather than list the cases when it occurs. In particular, all movement cases should yield reconstruction effects: this is uncontroversial in A-bar movement cases, but is perhaps still controversial in A-movement cases. Reconstruction both for binding and/or scope is uncontroversially available in A-movement cases (as Lebeaux has shown).

e.g. for scope, we have "Q-lowering": *a unicorn seems to be in the garden*, the scope *seem* > *a unicorn* is possible

The interesting observation is: reconstruction is not always possible.

Whether a raised DP can reconstruct depends on the nature of the D.

Very Roughly: all DPs weak D's reconstruct except [no NP] but no strong DPs reconstruct:

e.g. for No:

No exponent was proven to falsify Fermat's theorem *prove>no, OK no>prove

(the facts are even clearer in French, because scope is overtly indicated with a particle "ne")

Conclusion: under A-movement, DPs reconstruct but not all.

2. Why should this be true???

if movement then reconstruction --> if no reconstruction, then no movement

(Aside: more generally, we should expect reconstruction iff copy, i.e. reconstruction iff movement or ellipsis).

We must conclude that raising to subject does not involve raising, at least not in the case of strong DPs!!!

Going back to the arguments for raising: they are of course based on the principle of locality of selection: the subject of *seem* is selected by the predicate of the infinitive so it should be generated in the infinitive.

BUT selection by predicates is always of NPs, never of DPs. So the arguments for raising show that NPs raise, not DPs.

Then we have a solution to the paradox: when there is evidence of D raising because of scope reconstruction, (weak Ds) the D's come from the embedded infinitive, but when we evidence that there is no reconstruction of Ds (strong Ds) the D was never in the embedded clause: it is generated in the main clause and the NP raises to it (to provide a restriction for it) (In effect, this is the same as saying that there is obligatory clitic climbing for subjects of infinitives...).

So we get the following underlying structures:

- a. seem [a unicorn to sleep ...]
 but
 b. the [seem [unicorn to sleep ...]]

3. What does this mean: it means that in certain cases, a predicate - *sleep* in b - is saturated in its clause by a NP, not by a DP.

The only reasonable conclusion is that this is always the case: Predicate saturators always are NPs, never DPs.

This means that (ignoring lexical decomposition) the underlying structure of

- c. the girls sleep
 is
 d. the [[girls] sleep]
 and not
 [[the girls] sleep]

The surface structure is then really [[the girls] [[~~girls~~] sleep]]
 (After association of the NP argument of *sleep* with the restriction of the D *the*.)

The D literally takes an NP (really a NumP) and a VP as its two arguments.
 (semantically the girl is a sleeping girl → conservativity as Fox notes in another context)

4. But we already knew this from another angle it turns out: the existence of synthetic compounds bear-hunter, girl-chasing, (which cannot include any D's, or number, or perhaps proper names depending on how they are or can be treated – DPs vs. NPs) already shows that N's (actually NPs but this requires work to show) CAN be predicate saturators. So DPs are more complex elements formed AFTER predicate saturation.

This also means that the example above is actually more complex. Compounding shows that both number and D are external to VP. The surface structure of d above really is:

[[the [pl girl]] [[p-girl] [[girl] sleep]]

with first association of the NP *girl* with Number (here plural), then association of the resulting Number phrase with the D *the*.

5. We also already knew this from another, in my view extremely fundamental, reason: locality of selection. Hilda Koopman and myself were led to the VP internal subject hypothesis precisely on this ground: the subject is selected by V, so it should be generated in VP, not outside of it. To the extent that this VP internal story works, it further supports locality of selection. But now, verbs or other predicates taking a DP argument never select D, they select N. By locality of selection we expect the VP to contain the NP part but NOT the D part.....

Splitting VPs.

The case for splitting verbs is simpler.

A-moved elements reconstruct but always optionally. If there could be a-movement for case reasons of an object across a subject, it should be possible to optionally reconstruct the subject lower than the position of the raised object: every transitive verb should be like a psych verb.

The fact that this is false indicates that the highest A-position an object can occupy is never higher than the position in which the VP internal subject is generated: the Accusative position is lower than the VP internal subject: this is Koopman and Sportiche, 91 or Sportiche 1990' proposal (made on grounds of locality but with a new, independent argument here).