

Resumed Phrases^{*}

(are always moved, even with in-island resumption)

Abstract: On the basis of the properties of resumption in colloquial spoken French, I conclude that resumption of a phrase by a pronominal element always involve run of the mill movement of this phrase, whether the resumptive pronoun is inside an island or not. I propose that such movement can take place in two steps, the first being one of the Left Dislocation options, which feeds a variety of possible second steps (e.g., wh-movement or Clitic Left Dislocation).

Keywords: Resumption, Movement, Island, Reconstruction, Dislocation, Clitic Left Dislocation.

1 Intro: Resumption

In this short article, I will discuss the syntactic derivation of resumptive constructions. The general schema for resumptive structures as compared with movement constructions is shown in (for illustrative purposes, pseudo-) English below, where X can be an island or not:

- (1) who ... [_X ... you saw a picture of <gap>...] (* if X is an island)
- (2) who ... [_X ... you saw a picture of him ...] (X an island or not)

In some languages (e.g. Standard American English), acceptable cases of resumption involve a resumptive pronoun in an island, but this is in no way the general rule cross linguistically. Although I will focus here on wh-constructions

^{*} Thanks to Dan Finer, Danny Fox, Ezer Rasin, Hamida Demirdache, Hilda Koopman, Isabelle Charneval, James Mc Closkey, Joseph Aoun, Lina Choueiri, Nicolas Guilliot, Norbert Hornstein, Nouman Malkawi, Peter Sells, Rajesh Bhatt, Richard Larson, Roni Katzir, Vincent Homer, Viviane Deprez, Uri Shlonsky, Yael Sharvit, the students in my UCLA seminar on Resumption, Francisco Ordoñez, Lori Repetti, and two anonymous reviewers.

(resumptive questions), this extends to some other resumptive constructions in (colloquial spoken) French, e.g. Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), restrictive resumptive relatives but not to appositives, and to some other languages too. I will conclude that resumptive structures can always involve run of the mill (wh-)movement, regardless of the location of the resumptive pronoun. I will also provide some evidence that they must, as would independently follow from Ockham's razor/minimalist parsimony.

Space limitations prevent but a brief discussion of the general implications of such conclusions for the analysis of resumption, as well as of one consequence, the background impetus for the present work, namely that resumptive relatives are compatible with the promotion derivation of relative clauses (which Sportiche, 2016b argues is the only derivation available).

1.1 Resumptive structures

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Reconstruction

As I will rely on reconstruction phenomena to reach conclusions about the syntactic derivation of resumptive structures, I first want to precisely spell out some of the assumptions I am making about relevant properties of reconstruction.

The most central assumption – cf. Sportiche, 2015 for a survey of motivations – is that (apart from possibly special cases - e.g. pseudo clefts - cf. Sharvit 1999), **reconstruction is a property of movement only**: an item can display displaced interpretation relative to its overt syntactic position only if it has moved from (/to) the position in which it is interpreted.

Regarding scope, I am further assuming, as is standard, that:

- (i) a pronoun bound by a quantifying element must be in the scope of this element at the syntax/interpretation interface (LF).

(ii) the *de dicto* reading of some expression relative to some intensional element is licensed only if it is in the scope of this intensional element.

The informative cases are cases in which an expression containing a bound pronoun or an expression read *de dicto* is not in the surface scope of its binder. In such a case, **total reconstruction** of this expression is required: some mechanism must insure that it ends up fully in the scope of its binder. By assumption this mechanism (be it syntactic or semantic reconstruction) crucially references the presence of a trace: reconstructability of an expression for pronominal binding or the possibility of a *de dicto* reading diagnoses the **possibility** for a trace to occur in the scope of the binder.

Next, regarding Condition C effects: If a sentence containing a preposed constituent with a name in it displays a non coreference effect between this name and a pronoun not c-commanding it, this diagnoses the **necessity** for there to be an **A-bar** movement trace lower than the pronoun. If such a trace was not required, there would be some derivation not violating Condition C. Furthermore, if only an A-trace was in the c-command domain of the pronoun, we would not expect a condition C effect as A-movement can (under certain circumstances) bleed condition C.

1.2.2 *Analyses of Resumption*

Consider a resumptive structure clause. To simplify, assume that there is some antecedent DP located at the periphery of the resumptive structure, RP the resumptive pronoun related to it:

DP_k RP_k

This RP and the DP must end up coindexed,¹ and other interpretive mechanisms then kick in to derive the appropriate representation.

There are two broad types of analyses regarding how RP is linked to DP.

First this could be achieved via an **Anaphoric Dependency**.

This anaphoric dependency could be a **Binding** relation akin to pronominal binding, as in McCloskey (1990) or Sells (1984): DP binds RP.

This anaphoric dependency could arise via **Agree** as in Rouveret (2008) or Adger and Ramchand (2005): the RP agrees with a peripheral probe and this relation is translated into the needed representation (for concreteness the probe is coindexed with DP).

This anaphoric dependency could be one of **identity under Ellipsis** as in (e.g.) Guilliot and Malkawi, 2007: they take RP to be a definite version of DP, where the NP restriction of the RP's definite article deletes under identity with the NP of the DP yielding a pronoun as in Elbourne (2001).

Secondly, this relation could be established via **Movement**.

In Aoun, Choueiri and Hornstein 2001's version, the DP originates as **doubling**, and thus coindexed with RP yielding [RP DP] as in "big DP" analyses. The DP subextracts from this big DP and undergoes normal movement.

In other versions, **RP itself moves, covertly** for Demirdache, 1991, 1997, **overtly** for Demirdache & Percus 2008, 2011. Movement of RP to the periphery creates a property (a lambda abstract) predicated of the DP: this yields the effect of the desired coindexing between DP and RP.

Although I will conclude in favor of a movement analysis, but different from either of the two options above: I will argue that movement of the DP (and not of RP) is always involved; and I will conclude that movement is not necessarily from a doubling position.

¹ This is good enough for our purposes here and will simplify exposition. To be more precise, in relatives, we would minimally need to have the head NP of the relative coindexed with the implicit NP restriction of the gap or the RP. All arguments about reconstruction will be about this NP.

2 Resumption in islands: Mixed Two-step

Cross linguistically resumption is found with resumptive pronouns inside or outside islands. Consider again the DP/RP configuration and let us examine the case in which the RP is separated from DP by an island boundary:

$$(3) \quad \text{DP}_k \text{ [XP ... [island boundary ... RP}_k \text{ ...}$$

Let us accept for now as is the norm (I will question it later) that islands are barrier for Movement/Agree relations: this excludes an Agree, a “big DP” doubling movement or an RP movement approach to the DP/RP link. But such structures are compatible with a binding approach of RP by DP, or an ellipsis of the RP’s NP under identity with the DP’s NP.²

More generally, it is perhaps now a universal consensus also that, when the RP is inside an island, there is no movement dependency linking DP to a position inside its sister constituent, here XP. The following data shows that this is incorrect. Consider the following (colloquial spoken) French pair of questions:

- (4) a. Quelle **photo de fiançailles**_k Jean pense que si son_k auteur vient, on est foutus?
What engagement picture John thinks that if its author comes, we are doomed?
- b. [Quelle **photo de lui_m**]_k j’ai dit à **aucun accusé_m** que si son_k auteur vient, on est foutus?
[What picture of him_m]_k I told noone_m accused that if its_k author comes, we are doomed?

In both, there is a resumptive pronoun RP *son/his* inside an island, namely the preposed conditional clause (underlined). In (4a), *photo de fiançailles/engagement picture* can be interpreted *de dicto*: John thinks there is such a picture (among several)

² A possible exception is covert movement of the RP as in Demirdache, 1991, 1997, but covert movement I assume is no longer an available option, given minimalist guidelines.

but in fact there aren't any, as I the speaker, knows; the picture he is thinking about is in fact a wedding picture. Given our assumptions about reconstruction, we must conclude that in (4a), there is a possible derivation in which the DP *photo de fiançailles/engagement picture* has moved from a position in the scope of the verb *penser/think*. This means that with this interpretation, the derivation must have proceeded as in:

$$DP_k \dots \text{penser} \dots \text{trace}_{DP_k} \dots [\text{island boundary} \dots RP_k \dots$$

In (4b), it is possible to interpret the pronoun as bound by the QP, demonstrating the presence of a trace. This means that with this interpretation, the derivation must have proceeded as in:

$$[DP_k \dots \text{pronoun}_m \dots] \dots QP_m \dots \text{trace}_{DP_k} \dots [\text{island boundary} \dots RP_k \dots$$

What these examples show is the existence of a movement derivation (non vacuously) preposing DP from some position P in structures such as (3), if the RP is inside an island: extraction can be from a position non local to the RP:

$$(5) \quad DP_k \dots [{}_P t_{DP_k}] \dots [\text{island boundary} \dots RP_k \dots$$

I will call such derivations “**mixed two-step**” or **MTS** derivations.³ Indeed, the link between P and RP cannot (normally) be a movement relation, while the relation between DP and P must be.

Furthermore, it can be shown that at least in some cases,⁴ DP **must** have moved from a low enough position regardless of where the (NP of the) DP scopes. Indeed, Condition C effects obtain, as they normally do with in wh-questions, when the RP is inside an island (underlined):

³ I am only concerned here with cases in which each step is from an A-bar position down.

⁴ It is easy to show this with wh-questions, or Clitic Left Dislocation. There are complications with restrictive relatives, which do not show Condition C effects as straightforwardly.

- (6) * [Quelle photo de **Jean_m**]_k **il_m** pense que si tu la_k brûles, t'es pas un ami
[What picture of John_m]_k he_m thinks that if you burn it, you're not a friend

This means that MTS derivations with RP inside an island are mandatory. This conclusion regarding the availability and necessity of MTS derivations raises a number of questions that I will address in turn:

- a. In (5), RP is located inside an island. Are MTS derivations (in principle) available and required when RP is not inside an island? I will answer affirmatively.
- b. Is there independent crosslinguistic evidence for such derivations: I will conclude positively by pointing to cases in Irish and Selayarese that display exactly this pattern of extraction.
- c. What can be said about the position P from which extraction can take place? Based on the crosslinguistic evidence for MTS derivations, I will tentatively answer that such positions are (typically clause-) peripheral topics.
- d. What impact does the existence of such derivations have on the the analysis of resumption? I will conclude that if DP is moved when linked back to a gap, as e.g. in relative clauses, DP must also move in RP structures, albeit possibly from a P-like position away from where the RP is.

3 Mixed two-step without islands

To investigate whether MTS derivations are (in principle) available when the RP is not inside an island, let us first place the RP in a movement accessible position⁵ and check whether the right kind of reconstruction effects obtain.⁶

⁵ This may not always be feasible. Indeed, it has long been noted (Cf. Rouveret, 2011, for a recent survey) resumption can (at least appear) to be a Last Resort option, at least in some languages: accordingly, resumption would thus be allowed only if movement is not (cf. Shlonsky, 1992). Additional factors are relevant too. In my (colloquial spoken) French, resumption markedly degrades if the RP is in a movement accessible position in the immediate

- (7) a. [Quelle **photo de fiançailles**]_k Jean pense que toi, tu veux (la_k) brûler
What engagement picture John thinks that you, you want to burn (it)
- b. [Quelle **photo de lui**]_m j'ai dit à aucun accusé_m que les flics, ils (l') ont retrouvé
[What picture of him]_k I told noone_m accused that the cops, they found (it)

And indeed, they do: in both, the NP (bold) can scope under the *de dicto* operator *penser*: *photo de fiançailles* can scope under *penser*, thus allowing a *de dicto* reading (John is mistaken about the nature of this picture). *Photo de lui* can scope under *aucun accusé* allowing a bound reading for the pronoun. I conclude that both preposed wh-phrases **can** have moved from some low enough position P.

Just as in the island cases, it can be shown that the wh-phrase **must** have moved from a low enough position. Indeed, Condition C effects obtain, as they normally do with wh-questions (regardless of the presence of the RP):

- (8) [Quelle **photo de Jean**]_m il*_m pense que toi, tu veux (la_k) brûler
[What picture of John]_k he thinks that you, you want to burn (it)

But this does not suffice to show that MTS derivations are available if RP is not inside an island. Indeed, what could be happening in such cases is homogeneous wh-movement steps proceeding from a position P forming e.g. a “big DP” [RP DP] with RP. This is what Aoun et al. (2001) argue is the case in Lebanese Arabic in such configurations. This would fit their schema:

- (9) DP_k ... [CP ... [bigDP RP_k [P t_{DPk}] bigDP]
 where (i) DP is subextracted from big DP

clause under its antecedent, and perhaps even more if the RP is the subject (the latter case recalling the “highest subject constraint” on resumption).

⁶ Note that despite the presence of the embedded dislocation, the embedded clause is not an island for non resumptive wh-movement. Both sentences are fine without the RP.

- (ii) ... does not include island boundaries
- (iii) movement proceeds successive cyclically via the CP edge(s)

Consider a movement derivation out of a non island involving several steps:

$$(10) \quad DP_k \dots [{}_P t_{DPk}] \dots RP_k \dots]$$

$$| \text{--- step2 ---} | \text{---- step 1 ----} |$$

To show that this qualifies as an MTS derivation, it must be shown that two steps (perhaps need not but) can have different properties, e.g. that steps 1 and 2 above, the step from RP to P and the step from P to DP can have different properties. We also know, because of the island MTS cases above, that there is no principled reason for the P/RP distance to be bounded (since P and RP can be separated by one, or more, island boundaries). In particular, the distance P/DP may be trivial (if P is already at the left periphery of the main clause).

Let us follow Iatridou 1995, who used Parasitic (PG) licensing to justify MTS derivations (to handle CLLD in Greek out of non islands).⁷ I will exhibit cases in which step 1 does not license PG but step 2 can. Following Nissenbaum (2000), I take it – for the cases I am looking at - that the crucial properties licensing PGs in VP adjuncts is the presence of a VP peripheral trace of the licensing A-bar movement. This allows the VP and the adjunct to type-match for predicate modification composition and to be predicated of this trace:

$$(11) \quad DP_k \dots [{}_VP t_k [{}_VP \dots [{}_VP V t_k]] [{}_VP\text{-adjunct } e_{PG} [\dots t_{PG}]]]$$

Example (12a) is a standard PG licensing configuration used as benchmark. In (12b) (for some reason not as good, possibly because high attachment of the adjunct is less easily accessible) the PG containing constituent is adjoined to the *vouloir/want* clause (as shown by the desired interpretation and the approximate

⁷ Angelopoulos and Sportiche (2016) argues that MTS derivations (of the relevant sort) are not warranted for Greek CLLD.

bracketing) and is licensed by wh-movement in the *vouloir/want* clause:

- (12) a. Dis moi ce qu'il veut que tu [comprendes t sans mémoriser pg]
 Tell me what he wants you to [understand t without (you) memorizing pg]
 b. ? Dis moi ce qu'il [[veut que tu comprendes t] sans même mentionner pg]
 Tell me what he [wants you to understand t] without (him) even mentioning pg

Adding RP to (12a) yields (13a), which is ill-formed. This means that the A-bar dependency with the RP in the most embedded clause does not license PG.

Crucially adding an RP to (12b) yields (13b) which is comparable to (12b) (in fact slightly better to my ear, possibly because the alternative with the adjunct attached low as in (12b) is not available). This means that the A-bar dependency in the *vouloir/want* clause does license the PG and is thus different from that with the RP in the most embedded clause:

- (13) a. * Dis moi ce qu'il veut que tu [**le** comprendes sans mémoriser pg]
 Tell me what he wants you to understand it without (you) memorizing pg
 b. ? Dis moi ce qu'il [[veut que tu **le** comprendes] sans même mentionner pg]
 Tell me what he wants you to understand it without (him) even mentioning pg

In other words, step 2 licenses PGs, but step 1 does not. This shows the existence, hence the availability of an MTS derivation even with RP not in an island.⁸

Now given that MTS derivations are available, consider the following RP example:

- (14) Dis moi quelle photo de Jean_k il_{*k} veut que tu [**la** regardes]
 Tell me what picture of John_k he_{*k} wants you look at it

⁸ That there are mixed steps is not in question. But as a reviewer rightly points out, exactly how (French) clitics are treated matters to the precise characterization of steps 1 and 2. Space limitations prevent me from discussing this here. I refer the reader to Angeleloulous and Sportiche (2016).

We observe a Condition C effect. This means that an A-bar trace of *quelle photo de Jean* (/what picture of John) must be present below *il* (/he). This shows that there is no alternative to a movement derivation (although the movement could either be a big DP derivation, or an MTS derivation from P lower than the pronominal subject).⁹

4 Analytical consequences: Movement and Resumption

Assume the theory of reconstruction presented above in section 1.2.1. Assuming that what French shows is general means that resumptive structures must always involve movement, albeit not necessarily from, and sometimes demonstrably not from, the RP position.¹⁰ This excludes all non-movement analyses (Binding or Ellipsis) and excludes all movement analyses where the relevant DP itself did not move (RP movement). This is only compatible with Aoun et al.'s 2001 “big DP” subextraction analysis (with P adjacent to RP)¹¹, although such analyses cannot be the only ones available as demonstrated by RP-in-island constructions as well as by the discussion of RP-not-in-islands in French (and Selayarese or Irish below).

5 Where is P and what is it?

Given the above assumptions and data, the existence of the position P from where movement can be launched in RP structures is not in doubt. Given the

⁹ Space limitations prevent me from discussing this here but the data suggests that in French, at least, step 1 does trigger Condition C effects. This means Condition C does not provide grounds to distinguish between the two derivations.

¹⁰ Small, preliminary survey of speakers of Lebanese Arabic or Hebrew (thanks to Lina Choueiri, Danny Fox, Roni Katzir, Yael Sharvit, and Sarah Ouwayda for their kind help) does suggest that the facts leading to MTS derivations hold there as well.

¹¹ Although it turns out that Aoun et al. (2001) does not provide direct evidence for the big DP analysis because it does not provide direct evidence that the moved DP must reconstruct as low as the RP (rather than lower than some binder).

crucial role that P plays in resumption, the study of resumptive constructions now becomes in part the study of where this P position can be, what interpretation is associated with it and what relation it bears to the RP.

As I will discuss in the next section, Selayarese and Irish make it plausible that P is (or can be) a clause (or phase¹²) peripheral Topic position, suggesting either that Hanging Topic Dislocation, or Clitic Left (or actually Right) Dislocation (see Alexiadou, 2006, for a comparative survey of their properties) are involved.¹³ Of course, only a detailed investigation in each language will determine the plausibility of the general approach proposed here and the particular instance of Dislocation used, if any.

6 Independent evidence for MTS derivations

I will now briefly provide independent evidence for the existence of MTS derivations based on patterns found in languages where MTS derivations are more easily detectable. This will also help narrow down what the position P is.

There are two well motivated cases in the literature which display the profile of MTS derivations: Selayarese and Irish.

6.1 Selayarese

Finer's 1997 abstract demonstrates the relevance of Selayarese:

“This paper deals with wh-questions in Selayarese, discussing two

¹² DP peripheral topics are found cross linguistically, and also in French viz. (i) *t'as vu [Jean_k [l'état où il_k est]]* / *did you see [John the state he's in]*, hence the possibility that extraction is from phase peripheral positions.

¹³ A Focus position is not a priori ruled out either. Although preposed foci typically leave a gap, unless preposed Topics which use resumption, RPs in some instances (e.g. weak forms in Lebanese Arabic, Hebrew or Welsh) could in fact be agreement markers and thus qualify as gaps.

superficially similar constructions that display different properties along the path between the wh-operator and the gap. The constructions behave differently with respect to weak crossover, the occurrence of overt complementizers and agreement affixes, and word order. I argue that these differences follow from the hypothesis that the gap in one wh-construction is formed by cyclic movement while the other construction involves simple binding between an A' position and a null resumptive element in an A (argument) position. The resumptive A' dependency, however, also displays some surprising movement diagnostics, and so I argue that a wh-operator enters the derivation in A' position, binds the A position, and then undergoes movement to its overt position...”

Finer (1997) thus illustrates the existence of an MTS derivation. Space limitations prevent me from illustrating in detail some aspects of the syntax of Selayarese relevant to determining the kind of position that P is. I only describe them abstractly. I will not discuss the similarities between the MTS derivation depicted below in (15a) and the successive cyclic (SC) wh-movement in (15b). They have to do with the fact that the dependency between the intermediate positions P-MTS and P-SC respectively, show all the properties of movement. But the two derivations differ in four respects:

(15) a. $DP_k \dots [P\text{-}MTS \ t_{DPk}] \dots [CP \dots V \dots RP_k \dots]$

b. $DP_k \dots [P\text{-}SC \ t_{DPk}] \dots [CP \dots V \dots t_k \dots]$

1. The complementizer of CP must be present in (15a) absent in (15b).
2. Selayarese is V first. But the preverbal position in the embedded clause can be filled by a Focused element in (15a) but not in (15b).
3. A WCO effect is observed in (15a) but not in (15b).
4. In both (15a) and (15b), the argument position RP or t is silent, but “definite agreement” is required in (15a), impossible in

(15b), and impossible with a clause initial focus as well.

Points 3 and 4 duplicate the distinction found e.g. in Romance languages, where Topicalization (whether CLLD or Hanging Topic) requires resumption (e.g. by a clitic, aka definite agreement) and does not trigger a WCO effect, while focalization precludes clitic doubling and does trigger a WCO effect (see Rizzi, 1997). Finer (1997) takes Point 2 to show that (15b) is derived by moving through the embedded preverbal focus position (as Rizzi 1997 does) while (15a) can't be.

Selayarese shows two points: first, it corroborates the existence of MTS derivations with RP not in islands. Second it exemplifies a case in which P is a “clitic doubled” Topic position, as Finer (1997) concludes. Finer (1997) also reports that step 1 of the Selayarese MTS derivation is not movement (reflexives do not reconstruct) and is island creating. This very strongly recalls what Aoun et al. (1998) report of Arabic: one type of CLLD-ed Topics (base generated) have exactly the same two properties, supporting Finer's conclusion that P in Selayarese is indeed such a Topic position.

6.2 *Irish*

Irish, as analyzed in McCloskey (2002), provides independent support for the existence of MTS derivations with RPs inside or outside islands, as well as information about P. A-bar extractions in Irish display two “standard” patterns A and B exemplified below (from McCloskey, 2002):

- (16)a. an t-ainm a hinnseadh dúinn a bhí _ ar an áit
 the name **aL** was-told to-us **aL** was on the place
 “the name that we were told was on the place”
- b. an rud a dtug sé orm mionnughadh go gcoinneóchainn ceilte é
 the thing **aN** brought he on-me swear[–fin] **go** keep [cond] concealed **it**

“the thing that he made me swear that I would keep hidden”

The key distinction illustrated below has to do with the complementizers, *aL*, *aN* and *go*, on the path from the missing argument to its antecedent, as well as B being limited to DPs.

(17) Standard Patterns

A: **XP_j** [_{CP} **aL** . . . [_{CP} **aL** . . . [_{CP} **aL** . . . **t_j** . . .]]]

B: **DP_j** [_{CP} **aN** . . . [_{CP} **go** . . . **pro_j** . . .]]

McCloskey (1990), for example, documents the properties of these standard patterns as follows:

Pattern A: **XP_k** [_{CP} **aL** . . . [_{CP} **aL** . . . [_{CP} **aL** . . . **t_k** . . .]]]

- (i) XP binds a gap (trace);
- (ii) the XP/trace relation shows all the standard properties of movement to an A'-position: island effects, weak crossover, and so on
- (iii) Intermediate complementizers marked *aL* display morphosyntactic evidence typical of successive-cyclic movement.

Pattern B: **DP_k** [_{CP} **aN** . . . [_{CP} **go** . . . **pro_k** . . .]]

- (i) DP binds a pronoun (without movement);
- (ii) No evidence for a movement dependency DP/pronoun: immunity from islands, absence of weak crossover effects (McCloskey 1990);
- (iii) morphosyntactic evidence (in the form of the default complementizer *go*) that intermediate C-positions play no role in establishing the binding relation. Note however the form of the highest complementizer *aN*.

The difference in island sensitivity is illustrated below (from Sells, 1984:200-201):

(18) a. **aL: island sensitive**

*an fear a bpóg me an bhean a phós
 the man **aL** kissed I the woman aL married
 “the man that I kissed the woman that married”

b. **aN: not island sensitive**

an fear a bpóg me an bhean a phós é
 the man **aN** kissed I the woman aL married him
 “the man that I kissed the woman that married him”

MTS derivations are illustrated by the existence of mixed chains (pattern #2 in McCloskey, 2002, section 5.2), which constitute a morphosyntactically transparent instantiation of derivations which I claim are found in French, Selayarese and elsewhere (cf. fn 10). They are found with RP in an island (19a), or not (19b):

(19)a. aon duine a cheap sé a raibh ruainne tobac aige
 any person **aL** thought he **aN** was scrap tobacco at-him
 “anyone that he thought had a scrap of tobacco”

b. an galar a chuala mé ar cailleadh bunadh an oileáin leis
 the disease **aL** heard I **aN** died people the island [gen] by-it
 “the disease that I heard that the people of the island died of (it)”

Abstractly, they display the following schema:

(20) $DP_k [CP \textbf{aL} \dots [CP \textbf{aN} \dots [CP \textit{go} \dots \textbf{pro}_k \dots]]]$
 $DP_k [CP \textbf{aL} \dots \textbf{t}_k [CP \textbf{aN} \dots [CP \textit{go} \dots \textbf{pro}_k \dots]]]$

Between *aN* and *pro*, there is no evidence of movement. But the presence of *aL* demonstrates that movement has taken place from a position P marked here

with t_k .

$$DP_k \leftarrow \text{step 2 (wh-mov.)} \leftarrow [P DP_k] \leftarrow \text{step 1} \rightarrow RP_k$$

Given what we see in pattern B, namely that a DP is found to the immediate left of *aN*: $DP_k [_{CP} aN \dots [_{CP} go \dots pro_k \dots]]$, the natural analysis is to take step 2 to have occurred from this position. While it is difficult to precisely identify the nature of this position, Rizzi's 1997 left periphery analysis makes it plausible to take it to be a high Topic, preceding some complementizers (such as *aN*).

6.3 Conclusion

MTS derivations of resumptive structures are available in French, whether the RP is inside an island or not. This pattern is duplicated in Irish, and to a lesser extent in Selayarese (where we do not know about the non island case). For French, because of Condition C effects, MTS derivations of at least some resumptive structures (wh-questions) are mandatory.

7 Brief crosslinguistic comparison

I will now briefly compare what is reported in Lebanese Arabic and what is found in Colloquial Spoken French.

According to Aoun et al. (2001), Lebanese Arabic RPs can be found in islands. No reconstruction is allowed inside the island, but as noted here (cf. fn 10), reconstruction is allowed to (a) position(s) outside of the island suggesting MTS derivations. Or RP can be outside of the island and allow reconstruction (perhaps all the way to RP – cf fn 11). Furthermore, Aoun et al. (1998) reports the existence of two kinds of CLLD, one with a moved CLLD-ed DP, allowing reconstruction (possibly down to the corresponding RP) and sensitive to islands

and one with a base generated CLLD-ed DP not giving rise to reconstruction and not sensitive to islands.

These two sets of facts can be related by taking MTS derivations in Lebanese Arabic to involve CLLD followed by e.g. wh-movement of the CLLD-ed phrase. When the RP is inside an island, the CLLD step must be created by non-movement CLLD, precluding reconstruction into the island. When the RP is not inside the island, the second step of an MTS derivation could either be from a moved CLLD-ed phrase or from a base generated CLLD-ed phrase, which should show no reconstruction below this base generated position.

In French, Guilliot (2006) notes that reconstruction can take place into islands with resumptive structures:

(21) Islandhood (weak adjunct island)

***Quel étudiant** es-tu fâché [_{Adjunct Isl.} parce que le doyen a renvoyé **t**]?

‘**Which student** are you mad because the principal expelled **t**?’

(22) Resumption in island

Quel étudiant es-tu fâché [_{Adjunct Isl.} parce que le doyen **l**’a renvoyé]?

‘**Which student** are you mad because the principal expelled **him**?’

(23) Reconstruction (here for pronominal binding)

a. **Quelle photo₁ de lui₂** es-tu fâché [_{Adjunct Isl.} parce que **chaque homme₂** **l₁**’a déchirée]?

‘**What picture of him** are you mad because **each man** tore **it**?’

b. **Quelle photo₁ de sa₂ fille** t’as vu le type [_{Rel Clause} à qui **chaque professeur₂** ***(l₁)** a montrée]

What picture of his daughter did you see the guy to whom each professor [it] has shown

As in Lebanese Arabic, sense can be made of this observation by postulating an MTS derivation where the first step is CLLD as in :

step 2

step 1

$$[\text{DP}_k] \leftarrow \text{wh-movement} \leftarrow [\text{P } [\text{DP}_k]] \leftarrow \text{CLLD} \rightarrow \text{RP}_k$$

Indeed, Angelopoulos and Sportiche (2016) show that CLLD in French displays all the reconstruction properties of movement dependencies, a finding consistent with Cinque's (1990) conclusion for Italian that CLLD of DPs (but not of PPs) can violate weak islands. But further, and apparently unlike what happens in Italian, Sportiche (2016a) shows that DP-CLLD, can even violate strong islands while simultaneously showing all the reconstruction effects into such islands - see (23b). This means that DP-CLLD is movement but violates islands (and thus requires modifying island theory).¹⁴

References

- Adger, David and Gillian Ramchand. 2005. "Merge and Move: Wh-dependencies Revisited". *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 161-193.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2006. "Left Dislocation", in *Syncom: The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Martin Everaert, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans, and Bart Hollebrandse eds, Wiley.
- Angelopoulos, Nikolaos and Dominique Sportiche. 2016. "French Dislocations are plain (Scrambling) Movements", to appear in *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2016: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Frankfurt 2016*", Martin Elsig, Ingo Feldhausen, Imme Kuchenbrandt, and Mareike Neuhaus, eds., John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

¹⁴ Guillot and Malkawi (2012) question the possibility of a movement analysis on the basis of the lack of Condition C effect. Space limitations prevent me from discussing this important point here. Let me merely note that while the **presence** of Condition C effects is easy to interpret, the significance of its **absence** is more complex to evaluate. In particular I believe that confounding factors weaken the force of the examples they provide. They will be discussed in Sportiche (2016c).

- Aoun, Joseph, and Elabbas Benmamoun. 1998. Minimality, reconstruction, and PF movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:569-597.
- Aoun, Joseph, Lina Choueiri and Norbert Hornstein. 2001. "Resumption, Movement, and Derivational Economy". *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:371-403.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Demirdache, Hamida. 1991. *Resumptive Chains in Restrictive Relatives, Appositives and Dislocation Structure*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Demirdache, Hamida. 1997. "Dislocation, Resumption and Weakest Crossover". In Elena Anagnostopoulou, Hank van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts (eds.), *Materials on Left- Dislocation*. *Linguistics Today Series*, Vol. 14: 193-231. John Benjamins.
- Demirdache, Hamida and Orin Percus. 2008. "When is a pronoun not a pronoun? The case of resumptives". *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Linguistic Society (NELS)*. Vol. 1. Anisa Schardl, Martin Walkow & Muhammad Abdurrahman (eds.).
- Demirdache, Hamida and Orin Percus. 2011. "Resumptives, movement and interpretation." In *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*, Alain Rouveret (ed.), *Series: Language Faculty and Beyond* 5. John Benjamin.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2001. "E-type anaphora as NP-deletion". *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 241-288.
- Finer, Daniel. 1997. "Contrasting A-Dependencies in Selayarese". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 677-728.
- Guilliot, Nicolas and Nouman Malkawi. 2006. "When resumption determines reconstruction". In *Proceedings of WCCFL 25*. Cascadia Press.
- Guilliot, Nicolas and Nouman Malkawi. 2007. "Reconstruction without movement". In *Coreference, Modality and Focus*, Luis Eguren and Olga Fernandez Soriano eds., 113-131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Guilliot, Nicolas and Nouman Malkawi. (2012). *On covariation & competition: How resumptives distribute and covary*. Handout. from the Resumptive Pronouns Workshop.

- Iatridou, Sabine. 1995. "Clitics and Island Effects". University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: Vol. 2:1.
- McCloskey, James. 1990. "Resumptive pronouns, A'-binding and levels of representation in Irish". In Randall Hendrick (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 23. New York/San Diego: Academic Press.
- McCloskey, James. 2002. "Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations". In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Daniel Seely, 184-226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nissenbaum Jonathan. 2000. *Investigations of Covert Phrase Movement*, MIT PhD Dissertation.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In *Elements of Grammar*, Liliane Haegeman ed., 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rouveret, Alain. 2008. "Phasal agreement and reconstruction." *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Marla Luisa Zubizarreta, eds., 167-195. The MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Rouveret, Alain. 2011. "Introduction: Resumptives, movement and interpretation. " In *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*. Alain Rouveret (ed.), Series: *Language Faculty and Beyond* 5. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamin
- Sells, Peter. 1984. *Syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns*, PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Sharvit, Yael. 1999. "Resumptive pronouns in relative clauses". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17:587-612.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1992. "Resumptive pronouns as last resort". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 443-468.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2015. *Reconstruction, Binding and Scope*, to appear the Syncom 2nd edition: *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Martin Everaert, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans, and Bart Hollebrandse eds., Wiley.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2016a. *Movement, Islands, Phase theory and the ECP*, unpublished ms. UCLA

- Sportiche, Dominique. 2016b. Relative Clauses are Matchless, Unpublished ms. UCLA. Talk presented in part as “No Phrasal Match (restrictive relative clauses are head raising and consequences)” at the International Congress of Linguists, Geneva, Switzerland (2013) and in part as “Relative Clauses: Head Raising only” at Generative Initiatives in Syntactic Theory 8, Universiteit Gent, Belgium.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2016c. Resumption. unpublished ms. UCLA.