

Reconstruction, Constituency and Morphology
Dominique Sportiche
UCLA

1. Problem: Several paradoxes arise with reconstruction under A-movement.

1.1. The first type of paradox is found in such paradigms as:

- (1) Some pictures of his_i mother seemed to everyone_i to be fuzzy
- (2) * His_i pictures seemed to everyone_i to be fuzzy
- (3) * He_i seemed to John_i 's mother to be sick

The lack of Weak Crossover effect and the (correlated) possibility to interpret *some* in the scope of *seem* in (1) shows that reconstruction under A-movement is possible (yielding a structure equivalent to: *It seemed to everyone_i that some pictures of his_i mother were fuzzy*) but makes it a mystery why Weak Crossover effects in (2) or Principle C effects in (3) cannot be undone under reconstruction. Since as expressed by the general principle in (4) [(4) *Moved constituents can (in principle) always reconstruct*], what moves (or more precisely what pied pipes) can reconstruct, it must be true that *what fails to reconstruct cannot have moved*. We conclude that *he* and *his* (uncontroversially analyzed as [DP his NP] and [DP he [NP_E]]) in (2) and (3) cannot have moved from inside the embedded clause. To reconcile this conclusion with a raising to subject analysis of *seem*, we will postulate:

- (5) A Determiner and its NP restriction are not generated as a constituent

The analysis of (2) then would be one in which the pronominal D is actually generated in the main clause with its NP restriction raising to it from the embedded clause as below:

- (6) [DP His_i ..] seemed to everyone_i [[NP pictures] to be fuzzy]

(We will assimilate this to the behavior of Romance accusative clitics - which are definite determiners - in "S-bar deletion" contexts: e.g. French *Pierre le voit [e partir]* with the D *le* in the main clause but the argument position in the embedded clause).

In full generality, (5) implies that Ds associated with say subject or object are generated outside the minimal VP containing these subject and object VPs so that a clause like (7) should include a base structure roughly like (8) (which will be further justified, see section 3 below):

- (7) This boy broke the windows
- (8) This.. the.. [VP [NP boy] [break [NP windows]]] (past tense not indicated)

In other words, arguments of predicates are NPs rather than DPs (or thematic positions are NP positions rather than DP positions).

1.2. The second type of paradox is found in cases as:

- (9) They pleased each other
- (10) Friends of each other *killed/pleased them
- (11) Friends of his parents *killed/pleased every boy

Examples (10) and (11) are fine with the psych verb *please*, a fact that can be attributed to the possibility of reconstructing the subject to a position lower than the object (cf. Belletti and Rizzi's 1987 or Pesetsky's 1995). (9) shows that reconstruction under A-movement, while possible, is optional (otherwise the reciprocal would lack an antecedent at LF). Given the well grounded proposal (e.g. Chomsky, 91) according to which DPs move by A-movement to get Case as in the schema:

Nominative position [Accusative Position [VP External Argument V Internal Argument]]

Examples (10) and (11) with *kill* - in fact all transitive verbs - should, contrary to fact, also be good with the subject optionally reconstructing to its thematic position and the object failing to do

so. To resolve this paradox, we conclude that *there is no A-position occupied by the object higher than any A-position occupied by the subject*: in other words: the accusative Case position in a simple clause must be lower than the lowest A-position of the subject (as in Sportiche, 1990):

Nominative position [..External Argument
 [Accusative Position ..Internal Argument]]

This can be made sense of in a Larsonian VP shell analysis which allocates more structure (e.g. Case positions) to the lower VP than previously supposed as below with $V_1 + V_2 = \text{kill or break...}$:

(12) Nominative Case Position ..._{[VP subject [V₁ [..Accusative Case position ..._[VP object V₂]}

2. **Thesis**: Given these conclusions, the main challenge is to have them follow from the general architecture of the grammar which will be argued can be done if syntactic representations are still further atomized and partitioned than currently assumed. I will suggest that (13) is also correct, and that (5) generalizes to (14):

(13) **Atomization** obeys the principle one feature/one syntactic projection (syntax manipulates features only - which can be concatenated by derivational processes, e.g. head movement). A subcase of this is the **Syntactic Decomposition** (illustrated in (12)) of (almost all) polyadic predicates in a collection of more elementary predicates each essentially in its own clause.

(14) **Partitioning**: quantificational properties of XPs (Determiners, Number, etc...) are generated independently from their lexical restriction, suggesting a model of syntactic organization in which heads of syntactic projections in a clause are hierarchically organized by **type**. Ds (or Number) are not generated as forming a constituent with their NPs: quantificational properties (D, Num) (of DPs) are represented outside the domain in which thematic properties are represented (VPs) (as illustrated in (8)).

3. **Consequence**: Taking into account both the conclusions of sections 1.1. and 1.2 within the general perspective of section 2, the structure of (7) becomes:

(15) this.. singular.. _{[VP [NP boy] [V₁ [..the.. plural.. _{[VP [NP window] V₂]] V₁+V₂ = break}}

It will be demonstrated that the properties of synthetic compounds in English corroborate these conclusions and can be explanatorily and uniformly treated in a way that alternatives (lexicalist treatments, feature percolation, ..) cannot achieve: synthetic compounds such as _{[N bear]-hunt-ing} or _{[N truck] driv-er} illustrate that (i) Nouns (actually NPs!) can saturate argument slots – cf. *book reading of books – corroborating the conclusion reached in (8). Furthermore, they exhibit properties (ii. Only one argument can compound: * child-gift-giving; iii. Only the lowest argument can compound: * Child giving of gifts, gift giving to children; iv. Subjects do not incorporate; v. Q's, Plurals, pronouns, and names do not incorporate: *she admirer, *Billy hater, *bears hunting) which fall out of simple “geometrical considerations (roughly: all the good cases only involve non verbal elements from inside the lowest VP since D's (including pronouns, determiners and proper names), number as well as all other arguments are outside of it.

4. **Theory**: An explanation of all these results will be shown to follow from a maximally strong version of UTAH itself derivable from and thus explained by a conception of strictly configurational definitions of predicate argument relations (à la Hale & Keyser, 1991) leading in turn to a strictly transformational approach to inflectional and derivational morphology and lexical decomposition (a return to early views on such matters (Chomsky, 1957) but unlike certain instantiations of ideas of parsimony (Chomsky, 1970, Chomsky, 1995)).