AN ARGUMENT FOR SYNTACTIC RECONSTRUCTION: DISTRIBUTIVITY AS VARIABLE BINDING

• **Synopsis:** In this talk I present a novel argument from Modern Greek (MG) for the syntactic nature of scope reconstruction, on the premise that it feeds Condition C. The argument is based on Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) of a non-quantificational DP that may receive a distributive or non-distributive reading, whereby only the former exhibits Condition C connectivity. I propose that the distributive reading obtains via binding of a covert contextual variable within that DP by a (surface-lower) Quantifier Phrase (QP), enforcing reconstruction to a position c-commanded by the QP. Moreover, I argue for the "everywhere" nature of Condition C, and I show that CLLD can be derived via movement or base-generation, each option systematically associated with structural and interpretive effects, evident in trapping environments.

• **Syntactic reconstruction:** Fox (1999) argues that Condition C speaks in favor of syntactic accounts of scope reconstruction, and against semantic type-shifting operations, because scope reconstruction feeds Condition C. If binding theory is sensitive to LF-structures, then only a syntactic account explains why reconstruction is impossible in (1): a moved QP that must be interpreted at its prior lower site contains an R-expression that is meant to be co-indexed with a pronoun c-commanding that launching site.

(1) $[_{QP}$ ... R-expression$_1$ ...]$_2$ ... pronoun$_1$ ... t_2

• **Main puzzle**: Well-studied instances of (1) involve reconstruction of a moved QP for binding of an overt variable. I present a novel construction from MG CLLD, where a fronted **non**-quantificational DP scopally interacts with a lower QP, and contains an R-expression meant to be co-indexed with an embedded pronoun that c-commands that DP's θ-site. I argue that a pattern identical to (1) holds, except that binding is covert and serves as part of the implicit domain restriction. Sentence (2), with a referentially unspecified *pro* subject of 'said', is ambiguous between two readings: a distributive (= for each professor x there is a grade y such that x was told that y should change, i.e., multiple grades) and a non-distributive (= there is a grade x such that each professor was told that x should change, i.e., a single grade). Crucially, co-reference of *Janis* with the null subject of 'said' is only possible with the non-distributive reading. The rough idea is this: if the distributive reading requires the CLLD-ed DP to fall under the scope of the universal QP at LF, then a lower copy, c-commanded by *pro*, must be activated, inducing Condition C connectivity.

(2)   [***O vaθmos tu Jani***]$_k$*, kseris*   [*oti* <u>pro</u> *ipe*   *se **kaθe kaθiχiti*** [*oti prepi* [*na   alaksi*   ____$_k$]]]
         the grade   of Janis know.2SG that ‾‾   said.3SG to **each professor** that must SBJV change.3SG
         'Janis' grade, you know that *pro* said to each professor that (the grade) must change.'

• **Semantic proposal**: I suggest that an implicit, contextually supplied atomic variable *C*, of type <e<et>>, takes a silent *e*-type pronoun as its argument and returns an <et> predicate that composes via Predicate Modification (Heim & Kratzer 1998) with the nominal restrictor. The *C* variable receives a value from an assignment function *g*, corresponding to a set (or property), which is then intersected with the set (or property) denoted by the NP restrictor; it thereby restricts the DP's domain via assignment of a function from professors to the set of assigned grades. The QP then undergoes (local) QR and binds the silent pronoun via Predicate Abstraction if the pronoun is assigned the same index as the QP's trace, yielding a reading "for every professor x there is a (different) grade of Janis y such that x assigned y". The variable may in principle be free, if carrying a distinct index, in which case the non-distributive reading obtains.

(3) $[[C]]^g = g(4) = \lambda x.\ \lambda y.$ y is a grade assigned by x & y is a grade of Janis

• **Syntactic proposal**: Whether CLLD involves movement (Kayne 1994; Angelopoulos & Sportiche 2019) or base-generation (Cinque 1990; latridou 1990) is debated. For MG, I propose that both options are available, but associated with distinct structural effects, and that the clitic that doubles the CLLD-ed DP accordingly instantiates a "true" or "apparent" resumptive (Aoun et al. 2001). First, I show that CLLD *can* involve movement because reconstruction for variable binding is possible but island-sensitive. Then, I argue that the distributive reading hinges on reconstruction of the CLLD-ed DP and not on QR of the QP, due to QR's locality and A'-profile: as a QP cannot bind a pronoun within a CLLD-ed DP that is associated with a resumptive clitic across an island (4), the distributive reading only obtains after reconstruction of the DP and therefore requires movement; c-command only of the resumptive by the QP is insufficient.

(4)   #[***O eθizmenos χos tis***$_i$]$_k$*, **kamia mitera**$_i$ ðe fadastike* [*poso   θa   **tu**$_k$=stixize   o dʒoɣos*]
         the addicted   son her   no.F   mother NEG imagined how.much FUT **3SG.M.DAT**=cost.3SG the gambling
         'Her$_i$ addicted son, no mother$_i$ imagined how much gambling would cost him.' (WH-ISL.→weak crossover)

• **Meaning is structure**: The choice of base-generation or movement determines interpretation: if the

CLLD-ed DP is separated by an island from its θ-position (filled by a resumptive *pro*) (5), no Condition C arises, but the distributive reading becomes unavailable, presumably due to absence of a lower copy.

(5) [*O vaθmos tu Jani*$_i$]$_k$, *evɣalan* [*ti fimi pos* pro$_{i/j}$ *zitise* *apo* **kaθe kaθiɣiti** *na* **pro**$_k$ *anevi*]
the grade of Janis took.out.3PL the rumor that ‾‾‾ asked.3SG from **each professor** SBJV go.up
'John's grade, they spread the rumor that *pro* asked each professor that (it) raises.' (CNPC→single grade)

Three derivations can then be considered for (2): (i) External Merge at the surface site, whereby the *C* variable never falls under the scope of the QP or *pro*, enforcing a non-distributive reading and circumventing Condition C; (ii) (successive-cyclic) Internal Merge, whereby the distributive reading (a) may or (b) may not obtain, depending on whether *C* carries or not the same index as the QP; still, *pro* must be referentially disjoint from 'Janis'; (iii) the one illicit derivation is where a distributive reading co-occurs with co-indexation of 'Janis' and *pro* due to mutually exclusive requirements. That option (ii.a) is available, combining the non-distributive reading with Condition C connectivity, will be shown via Condition A and crossover effects. That distributivity hinges on the distinction between External and Internal Merge is supported by making the CLLD-ed DP the object of the deepest verb: if it appears in accusative (6a), with its θ-case signaling movement, the distributive reading is possible but island-sensitive, while co-reference between *pro* and 'Janis' is disallowed; if it appears in (default) nominative, as hanging topic (6b), Condition C can be obviated and island-sensitivity disappears, but the distributive reading is then lost.

(6) a. [*Ton vaθmo tu Jani*$_i$]$_k$, pro$_{*i/j}$ *ipe* *se* **kaθe kaθiɣiti** [*oti* pro$_{*i/j}$ **ton**$_k$=*perimene* __$_k$]
the.ACC grade of Janis, ‾‾‾ said.3SG to **each professor** that ‾‾‾ 3SG.M.ACC=expected.3SG
'Janis' grade, *pro* said to each professor that *pro* expected (it).' (ACC→*n*-grades - apparent resumption)

   b. [*O vaθmos tu Jani*$_i$]$_k$, pro$_{i/j}$ *ipe* *se* **kaθe kaθiɣiti** [*oti* pro$_{i/j}$ **ton**$_k$=*perimene* __$_k$]
the.NOM grade of Janis ‾‾‾ said.3SG to **each professor** that ‾‾‾ 3SG.M.ACC=expected.3SG
'Janis' grade, *pro* said to each professor that *pro* expected (it).' (NOM → single grade - true resumption)

• **Condition C is ubiquitous**: Even if an intermediate reconstruction site is available between *pro* and the QP for the distributive reading (t$_k$'), Condition C is not bled. If Condition C is an "everywhere" LF-condition (Belletti & Rizzi 1988), a mover leaves an LF-visible copy at every (intermediate) step on its path, regardless of distributivity. The same will be shown to hold for A-movement (passive and raising).

(7) [*Ton vaθmo tu Jani*$_i$]$_k$, **kaθe kaθiɣitis** *iksere* [t$_k$' *oti* pro$_{*i/j}$ *ðe θa* **ton**$_k$=*anexti* t$_k$]
the.ACC grade of Janis **each professor** knew.3SG that ‾‾‾ not will 3SG.M.ACC=tolerate.3SG
'Janis' grade, each professor knew that *pro* will not tolerate (it).' (ACC→Cond. C irrespect. of distributivity)

• **Further implications**: If the distributive reading obtains via variable binding, it should be sensitive to Weak Crossover (WCO). Indeed, with ditransitives (8), a distributive reading is possible if the indirect object QP appears as a bare dative, which c-commands the direct object in the base structure, but not as its PP counterpart, where the base order of objects is reversed, and QR across the theme would be required.

(8) [*To teliko draft*]$_k$, *o Janis* **to**$_k$=*takse* *tu kaθe ekdoti* t$_k$ / t$_k$ *se kaθe ekdoti*
the final draft the Janis 3SG.N.ACC=pledged.3SG DAT each publisher to each publisher
'The final draft, Janis pledged it to each publisher.' (DAT QP IO→binding - PP QP IO→WCO)

While the distributive reading is marginal in (9), presumably due to WCO, it *is* acceptable with object-experiencer psych-predicates like 'upset' (10). Crucially, Landau (2010) argues that such object experiencers are locative arguments which undergo LF A-movement, akin to locative inversion, to an outer specifier of the projection hosting the surface subject. If so, the contrast follows: the theme QP independently A-moves across the subject only under the psych-predicate, whence it can feed variable binding.

(9) *O vaθmos tu Jani* <u>ekseθese</u> **kaθe kaθiɣiti**   (10) *O vaθmos tu Jani* <u>anastatose</u> **kaθe kaθiɣiti**
the grade of Janis exposed **each professor**   the grade of Janis upset **each professor**
'Janis' grade exposed each professor.' (1 grade)   'Janis' grade upset each professor.' (*n*-grades)

Deriving CLLD with movement, conflicting interactions between Condition C, variable binding and distributivity can be captured via trapping effects: in (11), the function of 'her son' as *pro* (via reconstruction to t$_k$' to comply with Condition C) is mutually exclusive with the distributive reading (via reconstruction to t$_k$ to fall under the QP's scope), while variable binding of 'his' and 'every mother' is licit at either site.

(11) [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ *O vaθmos tu ɣiu tis*$_i$]$_k$, *kamia mitera*$_i$ *ðe ðianoθike* [$_{CP}$ t$_k$' *oti* pro *θa eleɣe se*
the grade of son her no.F **mother** NEG conceived.of.3SG that ‾‾‾ FUT said.3SG to

kaθe kaθiɣiti [$_{CP}$ t$_k$ *pos prepi* [$_{CP}$ t$_k$ *na alaksi*]]]]
each professor that must SBJV change.3SG
'The grade of her$_i$ son, no mother$_i$ imagined that *pro* would say to every professor that (it) must change.'