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In this paper, I argue against A-movement reconstruction, based on English and Korean data, thus supporting the thesis against A-movement reconstruction as advocated by Chomsky (1995) and Lasnik (1999) among others. The result of the present research also has a nontrivial theoretical implication for pronominal binding, which as I claim should apply derivationally as opposed to Fox (2000) and Sportiche (2001).
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1. Introduction

In this paper, I will review arguments both against and for A-movement reconstruction and will show that the arguments for A-movement reconstruction do not really go through. Then I will present data from Korean to further support the thesis against A-movement reconstruction as advocated by Chomsky (1995) and Lasnik (1999) among others. Finally, based on the conclusion regarding A-movement reconstruction, I will argue that pronominal binding should apply derivationally.

2. Argument Against A-movement Reconstruction

Chomsky (1995) argues that reconstruction is a reflex of the process

*I would like to thank three anonymous reviewers of Language Research for comments and suggestions. Part of this paper was presented in the 8th Pan Pacific Applied Linguistics Conference. I would like to express my special thanks to the audience for comments.
of reconstruction understood in minimalist terms, a consequence of the
formation of operator-variable constructions driven by Full Interpretation.
He claims that reconstruction process thus be restricted to the special
case of A'-movement that involves operators, but not A-movement as
below in (1):\(^3\)

\[\text{John seems [that } t_2 \text{ [it was told } t_1 \text{ [that...]]]]\]
(Chomsky 1995: 326)

His claim seems conceptually plausible, since if reconstruction in
A-chain is allowed such that the intermediate trace \( t_2 \) in (1) is freely
deleted, the improper movement of \( \text{John} \) cannot be blocked.

2.1. Binding and PRO Construal

The conceptual claim against A-movement reconstruction is also sup­
ported by the data involving Binding Condition B and PRO construal,
as illustrated below in (2-3).

\[\text{*John expected him to seem to me [t to be intelligent]}\]
(Chomsky 1995: 326)

\[\text{PRO to appear [t to be intelligent] is harder than one might}
\text{think.}\]
(Chomsky 1995: 327)

Chomsky (1995) observes that the example above in (2) can only be
construed as Binding Condition B violation, though with reconstruction,
the violation should be obviated with \( \text{him} \) interpreted in the position
occupied by the trace.\(^3\) Similarly, if A-movement reconstructs, one can­
not explain the quasi-agentive reading of PRO above in (3) commonly
conferred to the surface subject position, according to Chomsky.

---

2) Throughout, I will assume Chomskyian proposal regarding A-moved copy, according to
which the copy is only accessible for theta role checking, (see Chomsky 1995: 312-313)

3) It should be noted, however, that the argument goes through with the notion of govern­
ing category as in Chomsky (1986), and Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) but not with the one
2.2. Scope

The following examples in (4) are taken by Chomsky (1995) as further argument against A-movement reconstruction:

(4) a. (it seems that) everyone isn’t there yet. \((\forall > \text{NOT}, \text{NOT} > \forall)\)
   
b. I expected [everyone not to be there yet] \((\forall > \text{NOT}, \text{NOT} > \forall)\)
   
c. everyone seems [ t not to be there yet] \((\forall > \text{NOT}, \ast \text{NOT} > \forall)\)
   
(Chomsky 1995: 327)

Chomsky (1995) argues that negation can take scope over the QP in (4a) and it seems in (4b) but not in (4c), thus concluding that A-movement is not subject to reconstruction.

Chomsky’s claim against reconstruction with A-movement is further supported by Lasnik (1999). Lasnik claims that the scope ambiguity above in (4b) between the QP and negation is due to the optional raising but not reconstruction of the A-moved QP. According to him, the example below in (5) exhibits scope ambiguity between negation and the universal QP.

(5) I proved every Mersenne number not to be prime.
   
(Lasnik 1999: 199)

(6) The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum of two primes.
   
(Lasnik 1999: 198)

Meanwhile the lack of scope ambiguity in the example above in (6) as he claims suggests that the object is raised overtly and does not reconstruct, crucially assuming that the object to the left of out marks the overt raising of the object across out. (see Johnson 1991, and Den Dikken 1995)

3. Potential Argument for A Movement Reconstruction

Below, to be fair, I will review major arguments for A-movement reconstruction in the literature, that is, scope ambiguity in intentional
context and scope freezing effects in May (1977, 1985) and Fox (2000). It will be shown that the arguments for A-movement reconstruction do not hold, contrary to appearance.

3.1. Scope Ambiguity in Intentional Context

According to May (1977), the example below in (7) is ambiguous between the reading where there is a certain politician who is likely to address John's constituency and the one where it is likely that there is some politician or other who will address John's constituency.

(7) Some politician is likely to address John's constituency.

(May 1977: 188)

May claims that the latter reading is due to syntactic lowering operation of the existential QP below the scope of the intentional operator likely as shown by the following paraphrase:

(8) It is likely that some politician is likely to address John's constituency.

The example below in (9) also has ambiguity between the reading that there must be some particular individual from NY who is very likely to win the lottery and the one that NY will yield a lottery winner whoever he or she is.

(9) Someone from NY is very likely to win the lottery.

(Fox 2000: 145)

The two readings are again attributed to the scope interaction between the existential QP and the intentional operator likely in Fox (2000), essentially in the spirit of May (1977).

The nature of scope ambiguity above in (7) and (9) as attributed to the syntactic operation of reconstruction (lowering) below the scope of the intentional operator likely, however, does not seem to be that convincing, given that the scope ambiguity in (7) and (9) can be equally accounted for otherwise, namely, the specific vs. nonspecific reading of the existential QP as noted by Lasnik (1999). Moreover, most im-
portantly, the fact that scope ambiguity also arises even in examples below in (10), which do not involve raising predicate, further strengthens the specific vs. nonspecific account of the scope ambiguity of (7) and (9).

(10) a. Someone from New York will win the lottery.
    b. An American runner will win the gold medal.

3.2. Scope Freezing Effects

The inverse scope of the universal QP in the following examples in (11) is taken as further evidence for A-movement reconstruction (see Aoun 1982, Hornstein 1995, Lebeaux 1998, Fox 2000, and Boeckx 2001, among others):

(11) a. Someone\(_i\) seemed to Bill \(_t\) to be reviewing every report.
    \((\exists \forall, \forall \exists)\)
    (Hornstein 1995: 160)

b. [At least one soldier\(_i\)] seems (to Napoleon) \(_t\) to be likely to
die in every battle. \((\exists \forall, \forall \exists)\)
    (Fox 2000: 145)

Hornstein (1995) and Fox (2000) among others claim that the source of inverse scope above in (11) is not quantifier raising (QR, henceforth) of the universal QP over the existential QP, but reconstruction of the existential QP, given the paradigm below in (12-13).

(12) a. Someone\(_i\) seemed to his\(_t\) boss \(_t\) to be reviewing every report.
    \((\exists \forall, *\forall \exists)\)

b. Someone\(_i\) seemed to himself \(_t\) to be reviewing every report.
    \((\exists \forall, *\forall \exists)\)
    (Hornstein 1995:160)

(13) a. [At least one soldier\(_i\)] seems to his\(_t\) commander \(_t\) to be likely
to die in every battle. \((\exists \forall, *\forall \exists)\)

b. [At least one soldier\(_i\)] seems to himself\(_t\) \(_t\) to be likely to die
in every battle. \((\exists \forall, *\forall \exists)\)
    (Fox 2000: 146)
The lack of inverse scope above in (12-13), according to them, is thus attributed to nonapplication of reconstruction of A-moved existential QP, since otherwise pronominal binding will not obtain at LF.

However, their claim does not seem to be that convincing, since the universal QP cannot take inverse scope even in the examples below in (14b) and (15b) where no raising predicate is involved. This state of affairs rather suggests that the pronoun bound by the existential QP, regardless of its order with respect to the universal QP, is somehow a contributive factor to the lack of inverse scope in (12-13), (14b) and (15b):4)

(14) a. A girl expected every boy to come to the party.
   \( (\exists \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V} \mathcal{V} \exists) \)
   b. A girl expected every boy to come to her party.
   \( (\exists \mathcal{V}, *\mathcal{V} \exists) \)
   (Fox 2000: 64)

(15) a. Some boy talked to every girl about John. \( (\exists \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V} \exists) \)
   b. Some boy talked to every girl about his girl friend.
   \( (\exists \mathcal{V}, *\mathcal{V} \exists) \)
   (Austin 2000)

4. Korean Data

Thus far I have shown that A-movement does not reconstruct and that the examples that apparently support A-movement reconstruction do not really do so. Below, I will discuss Korean scrambling data to further support the thesis against A-movement reconstruction. It will be shown that an important consequence for pronominal binding follows from the conclusion that A-movement does not reconstruct.

4) Jean-Roger Vergnaud (personal communication) notes that within a framework such as the minimalist program making use of generalized transformations, it is possible for the structural description of seem as in (11-13) to include the proposition 'NP to VP' without seem ever taking that proposition as an argument, whose implications I will however discuss in another occasion.
4.1. Weak Crossover Effects

To lay the groundwork for our discussion later on of whether A-movement reconstructs or not in Korean scrambling, it is important to determine the type of movement involved in scrambling. For this, I will turn to Weak Crossover (Postal 1971, Wasow 1972, Chomsky 1976, and Higginbotham 1980 among others), which has been taken as a standard test for A'-movement in the literature. In this context, consider the following paradigm in (16-17):

(16) ?Enu kyoswu-lul ku-ui haksayng-i t_i chotayhayss-ni?
    which professor-ACC he-POSS student-NOM invited-QM
   *"Which professor_i did his_i student invite?"

(17) a. 'Enu kyoswu-lul ku-ui haksayng-i [cp-ne-ka
    which professor-ACC he-POSS student-NOM you-NOM
    t_i chotayhaysssta-ko] sayngkakha-ni?
    invited-COMP think-QM
   *"Which professor_i does his_i student think you invited?"

b. ?Enu kyoswu-lul ne-nun [cp-ku-ui haksayng-i
    which professor-ACC you-TOP he-POSS student-NOM
    t_i chotayhaysssta-ko] sayngkakha-ni?
    invited-COMP think-QM
   *"Which professor_i do you think his_i student invited?"

The example above in (16) with a scrambled wh-phrase in monoclusal construction is grammatical with no Weak Crossover effect, while the examples above in (17) with a scrambled wh-phrase in biclausal construction exhibit variation with respect to Weak Crossover effects, depending on whether the NP with ku 'he' construed as a bound variable is a matrix subject or an embedded subject.\(^5\)\(^6\)

---

5) I believe the slightly deviant status of the examples in (16) and (17b) is not due to Weak Crossover but rather due to the fact that ku 'he' does not readily yield bound variable reading as compared with English 'he'. See Kang (1988), Suh (1990) for the discussion of bound variable reading of ku, 'he'.

6) I should note, however, that the present judgement regarding the data in (17) is quite controversial. Two of the reviewers seem to agree that grammaticality of the example in (17b) is more or less on a par with that of the one in (17a) in that both are marginal, although they admit that the former is slightly better than the latter.
Given that Weak Crossover is a standard test for A'-movement, one may attribute the grammaticality of (16) to A-movement of the scrambled expressions in monoclausal construction, thus immune to Weak Crossover effects. When it comes to scrambling in biclausal construction in (17), the grammaticality of (17b) suggests that the initial movement to the left periphery of the embedded clause crossing the embedded subject NP with ku 'he' is A-movement, immune to Weak Crossover effects. Meanwhile, the ungrammaticality of (17a) suggests that the subsequent movement from the embedded clause into the surface position crossing the matrix subject NP with ku 'he' is A'-movement, hence subject to Weak Crossover effects. The data above in (16-17) thus suggest that Korean monoclausal scrambling is A-movement whereas the same operation in biclausal construction is a combination of initial A-movement to the left periphery of the embedded clause and the subsequent A'-movement to the surface position, essentially in agreement with the conclusion originally reached by Mahajan (1990) from Hindi scrambling.

4.2. Binding Condition C

Given the typology of movement involved in scrambling as shown in (16-17), one may now take the examples below in (18-19) involving Binding Condition C (Chomsky 1981 among others) as an argument against A-movement reconstruction: 7)8)9)

7) A wh-phrase containing an adjunct is excluded to control the potential intervening factor of the adjunct in reconstruction as noted in Van Riemsdijk and Williams (1981), and Lebeaux (1988, 1990), among others.

8) A reviewer wonders whether Condition C of the binding theory is part of the grammar, given that there are instances where the condition does not hold as reported by Evans (1980), Chomsky (1981), and Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993). This, however, does not motivate one to discard the condition as part of the grammar, since the examples may suggest that there is a general discourse (pragmatic) principle in addition to Binding Condition C, which however is not the present concern. (see Chomsky 1981: 227, among others)

9) The present judgement regarding the data in (18-19) is quite controversial. Two of the reviewers note that the example in (18) is marginal. The two reviewers also note that the examples in (19) are marginal too, although they admit that (19b) is slightly better than (19a).
(18) ?[Johni-uy enu  sacin-ul]i  ku₁-ka  ceyil tj  sileha-ni?
  J-POSS  which  picture-ACC  he-NOM  most  dislike-QM
  *‘Which picture of Johni does hei dislike most?’

(19) a. ?[Johni-uy  enu  sacin-ul]i  ku₁-nun  [CP ne-ka  tj]
      J-POSS  which  picture-ACC  he-TOP  you-NOM
      ceil  silehanta-ko  sayngkakha-ni?
      most  dislike-COMP  think-QM
      *‘Which picture of Johni does hei think you dislike most?’

b. ?[Johni-uy  enu  sacin-ul]i  ne-nun  [CP  ku₁-ka  tj]
      J-POSS  which  picture-ACC  you-TOP  he-NOM
      ceyil  silehanta-ko  sayngkakha-ni?
      most  dislike-COMP  think-QM
      *‘Which picture of Johni do you think hei dislikes most?’

Scrambled wh-phrases with an R expression in monoclausal construction do not show Binding Condition C effect as shown above in (18). But when it comes to scrambling in biclausal construction above in (19), the same expressions show variation regarding Binding Condition C effect, depending on whether ku ‘he’ with the R-expression as its antecedent is a matrix or an embedded subject.

Recall that scrambling in monoclausal constructions is A-movement whereas scrambling in biclausal construction is a combination of initial A-movement to the left periphery of the embedded clause and the subsequent A’-movement to the surface position. The pattern of grammaticality in (18-19) will follow only if A-movement is not subject to reconstruction and Binding Condition C applies at LF, a conclusion which is essentially in agreement with Chomsky (1995).10)11)12)

10) I will not include data regarding Binding Condition B in the present paradigm regarding reconstruction. Please note that one cannot determine whether the ungrammaticality of the example below in (ia) is due to Binding Condition B violation after reconstruction or simply is due to Binding Condition C violation before reconstruction given the ungrammaticality of the example below in (ib).

(i) a. *Ku₁-lul  Johni-i  silehanta.
      he-ACC  J-NOM  hate

b. *Johni-i  ku₁-lul  silehanta.
      J-NOM  he-ACC  hate

11) A reviewer notes that the example below may be an argument against the claim that monoclausal scrambling is A-movement, suggesting that the scrambled object is an in-
4.3. Pronominal Binding

As we have seen thus far, Korean data regarding Binding Condition C also suggest that A-movement does not reconstruct. One may however argue that A-movement does in fact reconstruct, given the following example in (20) with a so called reciprocal anaphor selo ‘each other’:

(20) ?Seloi-lul [John-kwa Mary]-ka ti silehanta.
    each other-ACC [John and Mary]-NOM dislike
    ‘Each other, John and Mary dislike.’

Since monoclausal scrambling is A-movement, one may take the grammaticality of the example above in (20) as suggesting that A-movement reconstructs, given the prevailing view of selo ‘each other’ as an anaphor. (see Yang 1984, among others)13)

However, the status of selo ‘each other’ as an anaphor has been recently challenged by Chung and Park (1998), and Choi (2004).14) Based on the original discussion of Japanese reciprocal expression otagai in Hoji (1997a), (1997b), and (2003), they claim that selo ‘each other’ is not an anaphor per se, given that it can enter long distance dependence, take split antecedence and does not need c-commanding antecedent as shown below in (21-23), all of which are characteristic properties of a pronominal.15)

 stance of A'-movement, hence subject to reconstruction.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{caki, emeni-lul motwu-ka salanghanta.} \\
\text{his mother-ACC everyone-NOM love}
\end{align*}
\]

Given that caki is a logophoric expression, one cannot argue that the above example is an instance of A'-movement. I will not include reflexive expressions, since they are claimed to admit logophoric construal, which may potentially interfere with our understanding of reconstruction effects. One of the questions typically raised in relation to reflexive expressions in the literature is whether they are subject to Binding Theory as part of sentential grammar. (see Clements 1975, Kameyama 1984, Kuno 1986, Reinhart and Reuland 1993, among others)

12) Based on QP and wh-scope interaction in Korean, Beck and Kim (1997: 361) independently reaches the conclusion that monoclausal scrambling is not subject to reconstruction.

13) As a matter of fact, Japanese counterpart of the example as above in (20) used to be taken as an argument for reconstruction. (see Saito 1989, 1992)

14) Hoji (1997ab, 2003) claims that otagai is not an anaphor in Japanese but rather a non-anaphoric expression with the internal structure of [pro otagai]. However, he does not commit himself to the specific status of [pro otagai] in terms of binding theory.

15) It is well-known that local anaphor cannot take split antecedent as shown below.
(21) [John-kwa Bill]-i [cpMary-ka selo-lul coahanta-ko] [John and Bill]-NOM M-NOM each other-ACC like-COMP sayngkakhanta.
think
a. ‘John thinks Mary likes Bill and Bill thinks Mary likes John.’
b. ‘Johni thinks Mary likes himi and Billj thinks Mary likes himj.’
c. ‘[John and Bill]i think that Mary likes themi.’

(22) Johni-i Maryj-eykey selo+iyuy nonmwun-eytayhay J-NOM M-DAT each other-POSS paper-about malhayssta.
talked
‘Johni talked with Maryj about theirij paper.’

(23) Selo-ka cohta-myen, [John-kwa Mary]-nun each other-NOM ok-if [John and Mary]-TOP hamkkey wato cohta.
together come may
‘If it is ok for themij, Johni and Maryj may come together.’

Based on the paradigm as above in (21-23), Choi (2004) claims that selo ‘each other’ has the internal structure of [pro selo]. He argues that [pro selo] is a pronominal in terms of binding theory, from which the properties of selo as a pronominal above in (21-23) follows. He further argues that various readings of selo in (21) repeated below in (24) also follows, given [pro selo] as a pronominal.16)

(24) [John-kwa Bill]-i [cpMary-ka selo-lul coahanta-ko] [John and Bill]-NOM M-NOM each other-ACC like-COMP sayngkakhanta.
think
a. ‘John thinks Mary likes Bill and Bill thinks Mary likes John.’
b. ‘Johni thinks Mary likes himi and Billj thinks Mary likes himj.’
c. ‘[John and Bill]i think that Mary likes themi.’

---

16) I will gloss selo as each other only for convenience sake.
Assuming the semantics of each other and its indexing mechanism in Heim, Lasnik and May (1991), Choi (2004) attributes cross, parallel readings in (24a) and (24b), which are instances of bound variable readings, to the pronominal binding of pro of [pro seleo] by the distributor antecedent of John-kwa Bill ‘John and Bill’.\(^\text{17}\)\(^\text{18}\) He further attributes group reading in (24c) to coreference between the antecedent and pro. The LF representations for cross, parallel and group readings for the example above in (24) are illustrated below in (25a), (25b), and (25c) respectively, with D referring to the distributor antecedent.\(^\text{19}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(25) a. } & \left[\text{NP}_1 \ D_{\text{k}} \right]_k \ V \ [\text{cpNP}_m] \ V \ [\text{NP} \ [[\text{pro}_k \ [\text{selo}]]_k] \ - \ POSS \ N]] \\
\text{b. } & \left[\text{NP}_1 \ D_{\text{k}} \right]_k \ V \ [\text{cpNP}_m] \ V \ [\text{NP} \ [[\text{pro}_k \ [\text{selo}]]_k] \ - \ POSS \ N]] \\
\text{c. } & \text{NP}_1 \ V \ [\text{cpNP}_m] \ V \ [\text{NP} \ [[\text{pro}_i \ [\text{selo}]]_i] \ - \ POSS \ N]]
\end{align*}
\]

Now, back to the example in (20), which in my intuition has cross reading only, it will roughly have the following structural representation, assuming the proposal for seleo by Choi (2004) as essentially correct:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(26) } & [[\text{pro}_k \ [\text{selo}]]_k] \ - \ ACC \ [\text{NP}_1 \ D_{\text{k}} \left]_k \ - \ NOM \ V \ t_i \\
\end{align*}
\]

Recall that cross reading is due to pronominal binding of pro of [pro seleo] by the distributor antecedent. Now, one may take two paths for pronominal binding. Since monoclusal scrambling is A-movement, one may take the example above in (20) as an argument for A-movement

\(\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\) According to Heim, Lasnik and May (1991), the structure of reciprocal each other in English as in (ia) is rather complex, consisting of the distributor each and the reciprocator other with the former undergoing LF movement.

\[(i) \ a. [\text{John and Mary}] \text{ love each other}.
\quad \ b. [\text{John and Mary}] \text{ each \_ love \_ other}.
\]

They suggest that the example above in (ia) has the LF representation above in (ib), which accounts for the bound variable reading of so called cross reading of ‘each loving the other’, which is the only reading available in (ia).

\(\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\) Partee (1978: 79-80), for example, defines bound variable reading in the following way: An anaphoric relation between two nominal expressions is either (i) coreference or (ii) bound variable anaphora. (i) When each of the two nominal expressions is used to refer to the same specific individual or object, the anaphoric relation between the two will be called coreference. (ii) Otherwise, the anaphoric relation between the two will be called bound variable anaphora.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\) Hereafter will use head initial notation for expository purpose.
reconstruction, assuming pronominal binding is an LF constraint, follow-

ing Sportiche (2001) and Fox (2000). The other is to suggest that it is a derivational constraint, maintaining that A-movement does not reconstruc-
t. To settle the matter, I will crucially consider the following examples in (27)20

(27) a. (?)[solo-uy haksayng]-ul [[ku-uy cito kyoswuin each other-POSS student-ACC he-POSS advisor is [John-kwa Bill]-i sinim hakkwacang-eykey sokayhayssta. John and Bill-NOM new Dept. chair-DAT introduced (Lit) '[A student of each other], [John and Bill], who are his advisor introduced to the new Dept. chair.’

b. (?)[solo-uy haksayng]-eykey [[ku-uy cito kyoswuin each other-POSS student-DAT he-POSS advisor is [John-kwa Bill]-i sinim hakkwacang-ul sokayhayssta. John and Bill-NOM new Dept. chair-ACC introduced (Lit) '[A student of each other], [John and Bill], who are his advisor introduced the new Dept. chair.’

The only felicitous reading of the examples above in (27) in my in-
tuition is parallel reading as respectively represented by the following informal logical notations in (28):

(28) a. For each x, x an individual out of the set John and Bill, y, student of x, x introduced y to the new dept chair.

b. For each x, x an individual out of the set John and Bill, y, student of x, x introduced the new dept chair to y.

Please recall that parallel reading requires pronominal binding of pro in [pro solo] by the antecedent. Then the question is how pronominal binding obtains in (27) given the following structural representation for parallel reading:

(29) [NP [pro_k [solo]_k-POSS N]_m-ACC [NP [ku_m]-POSS N D]_k-NOM V t_m

20) Please note that the lack of Weak Crossover in (27) indicates that the relevant movement is A-movement.
If pronominal binding is an LF constraint as claimed by Fox (2000) and Sportiche (2001), the grammaticality of the examples above in (27) is quite puzzling since pronominal binding can never be satisfied at a single level of representation. To satisfy pronominal binding of pro of [pro selo] at LF, [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] should be reconstructed to the base position such that pro of [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] is bound by the antecedent John-kwa Bill ‘John and Bill.’ This, however, blocks pronominal binding of ku ‘he’ by the antecedent [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] at LF.

Conversely, once pronominal binding is taken as a derivational constraint, the data above in (27) pose no problem, since pronominal binding of [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] by the antecedent John-kwa Bill ‘John and Bill’ can be satisfied prior to movement of the former, and similarly pronominal binding of ku ‘he’ by the antecedent [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] can also be satisfied at Spellout after movement of [[pro selo]-uy haksayng]] to the surface position. The data above in (27) hence strongly suggest that pronominal binding cannot be an LF constraint but should apply derivationally.

Now given the claim that pronominal binding should apply derivationally, the example in (20) cannot be taken as an argument for A-movement reconstruction.

The present claim for the pronominal binding as a derivational constraint, if on the right track, entails that pronominal binding involving subject raising, passive construction, and psyche verb construction in English below in (30-32) should be treated on a par with Korean examples as discussed above.

(30) a. His\textsubscript{i} mother seems to every man\textsubscript{i} to be quite wonderful.
    (Lebeaux 1998: 16)
    b. Someone from his\textsubscript{i} class seems to every professor\textsubscript{i} to be a genius.
    (Fox 2000:147)

(31) His\textsubscript{i} tutor is admired by every boy\textsubscript{i}.
    (Fox 2000: 37)

(32) His\textsubscript{i} mother pleases every man\textsubscript{i}.
    (Lebeaux 1998: 8)
The grammaticality of the examples above in (30-31) thus should be attributed to the pronominal binding of his by its antecedent at D structure. The grammaticality of the examples in (32) is also accounted for essentially in the same fashion. Given the assumption that the surface subject in the psyche verb construction is actually base-generated in a position structurally lower than the object, the pronominal in (32) is c-commanded by the antecedent at D structure. (see Belletti and Rizzi 1988 among others)

5. Conclusion

To summarize, the picture emerging from paradigms involving English and Korean is that A-movement is not subject to reconstruction. The result of the present research also suggests that pronominal binding should apply derivationally, contrary to the claim in the literature as in Fox (2000) and Sportiche (2001).
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