ATB reconstruction puzzles

The aim of this paper is to argue (i) that some instances of ATB movement are driven by the requirement of linearization in the sense of Moro (2000), and (ii) that anti-reconstruction effects which they exhibit can be assimilated to Nevins and Anand’s (2003) generalization that movement involves no agreement disallows reconstruction.

Moltmann (1992) argues that indefinites in A-positions cannot undergo Across-The-Board (ATB) reconstruction, based on the fact that (1a) cannot be interpreted as (1b). Only a single man is involved in (1a), who walked down the street and was killed. If ATB reconstruction of the subject were available, (1a) would be interpreted as (1b). However, his claim is challenged by (2a). Fox (2000) observes that the object QPs can take wide scope over the subject in (2a). I assume, following Hornstein (1995) and Johnson and Tomioka (1997), among others, that in order for a subject to take narrow scope, the subject needs to undergo reconstruction to the position where it is c-commanded by the moved object. (2a) will have the derivation given in (2b) for narrow scope of the subject, where the indefinite subject undergoes ATB reconstruction, contrary to Moltmann’s expectation. However, if the second conjunct includes an auxiliary as shown in (3), the relevant wide scope becomes unavailable, which has not been paid attention to in the literature. The interaction between negation and QPs confirms the same point. In (4a), negation can take wide scope over the subject, which indicates that the latter can be reconstructed into each conjunct, as shown in (5a). However, in (4b), negation fails to take wide scope. ATB reconstruction of the subject is blocked in (5b). This peculiar property is observed not only in A-movement but also in A’-movement. Moltmann (1992:137) observes that (6a) is ambiguous. For example, (7a) and (7b) are felicitous for (6a). However, I observe that wide scope of every student is not available in (6b), which indicates that ATB reconstruction of the wh-phrase is blocked. Thus, (7b) is not felicitous for (6b).

In this paper, I adopt a multi-dominance approach, proposed by Goodall (1987), Moltmann (1992), and Citko (2003), among others. Under this type of approach, a constituent can be directly dominated by more than one node, as illustrated in (8), which raises a problem concerning linearization (e.g. Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom). Citko argues that the structure (8) can be linearized as long as β moves overtly, following Chomsky (1995), among others, that the process of linearization applies at the phonological component. Thus, ATB movement involves structures such as (8) before movement. Along this line, I argue that (4b) has the derivation shown in (9), where everyone is shared by the two vPs in the base-generated position. Each of the Ts induces agreement with everyone and the latter moves to [Spec, TP] for the EPP. Note that everyone is still multiply dominated by the two Ts at [Spec, TP]. After the two Ts are coordinated with recourse to &, everyone moves out of the conjunct and adjoins to &P in (9).

What triggers movement of everyone? There is no functional category that triggers everyone, which has no feature for triggering movement either. I propose that movement of everyone has nothing to do with any feature checking, but rather is driven by the requirement of linearization in the sense of Moro (2000), who claims that movement is driven for the search of antisymmetry. Everyone undergoes ATB movement to the position that can be linearized. If everyone remained in [Spec, TP], which is dominated by the two Ts, then the structure could not be linearized. This proposal gives an explanation for the failure of ATB reconstruction in (4b), combined with Nevins and Anand’s (2003) generalization that XP cannot undergo reconstruction, if agreement is not involved in movement of XP. One of their evidence is given in (10). In (10a), the ergative subject, which does not trigger agreement, must take wide scope over the nominative object. In contrast, the nominative subject, which triggers agreement, can take narrow scope in (10b). They argue that the contrast given in (10) indicates that ergative subjects do not reconstruct to the lower position than the moved object, whereas nominative subjects do. ATB-movement of everyone in (9) has nothing to do with agreement either and thus everyone cannot be reconstructed into each conjunct. In contrast, (4a) involves coordination of vPs and ATB-movement of everyone to [Spec, TP] involves agreement with T, which allows reconstruction into each conjunct. This is shown in (11). A similar explanation is given to the contrast in the other cases. As a theoretical implication, the present analysis supports Lasnik’s (1995) view of verbal morphology, where English verbs other than have and be are introduced as bare and undergo PF merger with T. First, let us consider (12a), where the objects cannot take wide scope over the subject. In (12a), each conjunct includes an inflectional morpheme, which is supposed to be base-generated on T, separately from the verb, under Lasnik’s analysis. Hence, (12a) should be analyzed as involving TP coordination in a similar way to (4b). ATB movement of the subject has nothing to with agreement and thus reconstructing of the subject is blocked, as expected. On the other hand, under Chomsky’s (1993) view that every verb is inflected in the lexicon, (12a) could involve vP coordination, as illustrated in (13), where nothing prevents T from undergoing checking with each verb in an ATB way. Since movement of a girl to [Spec, TP] involves agreement, it is wrongly expected that ATB reconstruction of the subject would be available, in a similar way to (11).
Examples:

(1) a. A man walked down the street and was killed.                         (Moltmann 1992:132)
   b. A man walked down the street and a man was killed.

(2) a. A guard is [standing in front of every church] and [sitting at the side of every mosque]. (every > a) (Fox 2000:59)
   b. A guard,1 is[every church2 [standing t1 in front of t2]] and [every mosque3 [sitting t1 at the side of t3]].

(3) #A guard [is standing in front of every church] and [is sitting at the side of every mosque].  (*every>a)

(4) a. Everyone didn't [eat cake] and [drink coffee].
   b. Everyone [didn't eat cake] and [didn't drink coffee].  (*neg>every, every>neg)

(5) a. Everyone,1 didn't [t1 eat cake] and [t1 drink coffee].
   b. Everyone1 [didn't t1 eat cake] and [didn't t1 drink coffee].  ATB reconstructionOK

(6) a. How many books did every student like and every professor dislike?
   b. How many books did every student like and did every professor dislike?  (wh>every, every > wh)

(7) a. Seven books
   b. Student A liked 7 books and Prof. B disliked 2 books, Student C liked 9 books and Prof. D disliked 4 books.

(8)

(9)

(10) a. Kisii šaayer-ne har ghażal lik’hii.
    some poet-Erg  every song-Nom write.f-Perf
    ‘Some poet wrote every song.’  (some>every, *every>some)
    b. Koi šaayer har ghażal lik’haa hai.
    some poet-Nom every song-Acc write.m-Impf be-pres
    ‘Some poet writes every song.’  (some>every, every>some) (Nevins and Anand 2003:102)

(11) a. Everyone,1 didn’t [TP t1 eat cake] and [TP t1 drink coffee]].
    [* every>a, every <a]
    b. [TP A girl1 [TP t1 ed [TP t1 hug every dog]] and [TP t1 ed [TP t1 kiss every cat]]].
    (Under Lasnik (1995))

(12) a. A girl hugged every dog and kissed every cat.
    b. [TP A girl1 [TP t1 ed [TP t1 hug every dog]] and [TP t1 ed [TP t1 kiss every cat]]].
    (Under Chomsky (1993))