

Against A-movement Reconstruction: Its Implication for Pronominal Binding*

Young Sik Choi
(Soonchunhyang University)

Choi, Young Sik (2005). Against A-movement reconstruction: Its implication for pronominal binding. *Language Research* 41(1), 209-226.

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).

Key words: A-movement, reconstruction, pronominal, binding

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):²⁾

- (1) *John seems [that [t₂ [it was told t₁ [that...]]]]]
 (Chomsky 1995: 326)

His claim seems conceptually plausible, since if reconstruction in A-chain is allowed such that the intermediate trace t₂ in (1) is freely deleted, the improper movement of *John* cannot be blocked.

2.1. Binding and PRO Construal

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

- (2) *John_i expected him_i to seem to me [t_i to be intelligent]
 Chomsky (1995: 326)

- (3) PRO to appear [t to be intelligent] is harder than one might 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 *him* interpreted in the position occupied by the trace.³⁾ Similarly, if A-movement reconstructs, one cannot 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 governing category as in Chomsky (1986), and Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) but not with the one in Chomsky (1981) as Lasnik (1999: 192-193) points out.

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] ($\forall > \text{NOT}, *\text{NOT} > \forall$)
 (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_i to be reviewing every report.
 ($\exists > \forall, \forall > \exists$)
 (Hornstein 1995: 160)
 b. [At least one soldier]_i seems (to Napoleon) t_i 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_i boss t_i to be reviewing every report.
 ($\exists > \forall, * \forall > \exists$)
 b. Someone_i seemed to himself t_i to be reviewing every report.
 ($\exists > \forall, * \forall > \exists$)
 (Hornstein 1995:160)
- (13) a. [At least one soldier]_i seems to his_i commander t_i to be likely to die in every battle. ($\exists > \forall, * \forall > \exists$)
 b. [At least one soldier]_i seems to himself t_i 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.
 $(\exists > \forall, \forall > \exists)$
- b. A girl_i expected every boy to come to her_i party.
 $(\exists > \forall, * \forall > \exists)$
 (Fox 2000: 64)

- (15) a. Some boy talked to every girl about John. $(\exists > \forall, \forall > \exists)$
- b. Some boy_i talked to every girl about his_i girl friend.
 $(\exists > \forall, * \forall > \exists)$
 (Ausín 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_i-lul ku_i-uy 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_i-lul ku_i-uy haksayng-i [CPne-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_i-lul ne-nun [CPku_i-uy 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 bi-clausal 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) ?[John_i-uy **enu** sacin-ul]_j ku_i-ka ceyil t_j sileha-ni?
 J-POSS which picture-ACC he-NOM most dislike-QM
 *“Which picture of John_i does he_i dislike most?”
- (19) a. ?*[John_i-uy **enu** sacin-ul]_j ku_i-nun [CP ne-ka t_j
 J-POSS which picture-ACC he-TOP you-NOM
 ceil silehanta-ko] sayngakha-ni?
 most dislike-COMP think-QM
 *“Which picture of John_i does he_i think you dislike most?”
- b. ?[John_i-uy **enu** sacin-ul]_j ne-nun [CP ku_i-ka t_j
 J-POSS which picture-ACC you-TOP he-NOM
 ceyil silehanta-ko] sayngakha-ni?
 most dislike-COMP think-QM
 *“Which picture of John_i do you think he_i 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. *Ku_i-lul John_i-i silehanta.
 he-ACC J-NOM hate
 b. *John_i-i ku_i-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) ?*Selo_i*-lul [John-kwa Mary]_j-ka *t_i* silehanta.
 each other-ACC [John and Mary]-NOM dislike
 'Each other_i John and Mary_j 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.

- caki_i* emeni-lul motwu-ka salanghanta.
 his mother-ACC everyone-NOM love

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]_j-i [cp Mary-ka selo_{i-l}] 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. 'John_i thinks Mary likes him_i and Bill_j thinks Mary likes him_j'
 c. '[John and Bill]_i think that Mary likes them_i'
- (22) John_{i-i} Mary_j-eykey selo_{i+j}-uy nonmwun-eytayhay
 J-NOM M-DAT each other-POSS paper-about
 malhayssta.
 talked
 'John_i talked with Mary_j about their_{i+j} paper.'
- (23) Selo_i-ka cohta-myen, [John-kwa Mary]_j-nun
 each other-NOM ok-if [John and Mary]-TOP
 hamkkey wato cohta.
 together come may
 'If it is ok for them_{i+j}, John_i and Mary_j 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]_j-i [cp Mary-ka selo_{i-l}] 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. 'John_i thinks Mary likes him_i and Bill_j thinks Mary likes him_j'
 c. '[John and Bill]_i think that Mary likes them_i'

*The men_i told the women_j about each other_{i+j}. (Hornstein 2001:186)

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 *selo*] by the distributor antecedent of *John-kwa Bill* 'John and Bill'.¹⁷⁾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.¹⁹⁾

- (25) a. [NP_i D_k]_k V [CPNP_m V [NP [[pro_k [selo]]_k-POSS N]]]
 b. [NP_i D_k]_k V [CPNP_m V [NP [[pro_k [selo]]]-POSS N]]]
 c. NP_i V [CPNP_m V [NP [[pro_i [selo]]]-POSS N]]]

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 *selo* by Choi (2004) as essentially correct:

- (26) [[pro_k [selo]]]-ACC [NP_i D_k]_k-NOM V t_j

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

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. [John and Mary]_i love each other.
 b. [[John and Mary₁ each₂]]₂ love [e₂ other]₃

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).

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.

19) Here after will use head initial notation for expository purpose.

reconstruction, assuming pronominal binding is an LF constraint, following Sportiche (2001) and Fox (2000). The other is to suggest that it is a derivational constraint, maintaining that A-movement does not reconstruct. To settle the matter, I will crucially consider the following examples in (27):²⁰⁾

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

The only felicitous reading of the examples above in (27) in my intuition 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 selo*] 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 [selo]]_k-POSS N]_m-ACC [NP [ku_m]-POSS N D_k]_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_i mother seems to every man_i to be quite wonderful.
(Lebeaux 1998: 16)
 - b. Someone from his_i class seems to every professor_i to be a genius.
(Fox 2000:147)
- (31) His_i tutor is admired by every boy_i.
(Fox 2000: 37)
- (32) His_i mother pleases every man_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).

References

- Aoun, J. (1982). On the logical nature of binding principles: quantifier lowering, double raising of 'there' and the notion of empty element. *Proceedings of NELS*, 16-35.
- Ausín, A. (2000). A-traces and Semantic Interpretation. Presented at CONSOLE X. University of Lund, Sweden.
- Beck, S. and S.-S. Kim. (1997). On wh-and operator scope in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 339-384.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi. (1988). Psyche-Verbs and θ -Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 291-352.
- Boeckx, C. (2001). Scope reconstruction and A-movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 503-548.
- Choi, Y.-S. (2004). The Structure of *selo* and Its Implication for Binding Theory. *Language research* 40, 681-694.
- Chomsky, N. (1976). Conditions on Rules of Grammar. *Essays on Form and Interpretation*, 163-210, New York, North-Holland.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht,

- Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its nature, origin and use*. New York, Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik. (1993). The theory of Principles and parameters. *Syntax: An International handbook of contemporary research* 1, 506-569, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Chung, D.-H. and H.-K. Park. (1998). On *Selo*. Proceedings of the 7th Japanese/Korean Linguistics, CSLI, Stanford.
- Clements, G. (1975). The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10, 141-177.
- Den Dikken, M. (1995). Particles. *Oxford University Press*, Oxford.
- Evans, G. (1980). Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 337-362.
- Fox, D. (2000). *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Grodzinsky, Y. and T. Reinhart. (1993). The Innateness of Binding and Coreference. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 69-101.
- Heim, I., H. Lasnik, and R. May. (1991). Reciprocity and Plurality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 63-101.
- Higginbotham, J. (1980). Pronouns and Bound Variables. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 679-708.
- Hoji, H. (1997a). *Otagai*. Ms., University of Southern California, Los Angeles. [Presented at WCCFL 16, University of Washington, March 1997].
- Hoji, H. (1997b). Bound Variable Anaphora. Ms., University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Also to appear at MIT Press.
- Hoji, H. (2003). Falsifiability and Repeatability in Generative Grammar: A Case Study of Anaphora and Scope Dependency in Japanese. *Lingua* 113, 377-446.
- Hornstein, N. (1995). *Logical Form: From GB to Minimalism*. Cambridge, Blackwell.
- Hornstein, N. (2001). *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Johnson, K. (1991). Object Positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 577-636.
- Kameyama, M. (1984). Subjective logophoric bound anaphora *zibun*. *CLS* 20, 228-238.
- Kang, M.-Y. (1988). *Topics in Korean Syntax: Phrase Structure, Variable*

- and Movement.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kuno, S. (1986). Anaphora in Japanese. S.Y. Kuroda, ed., Papers from the First SDF Workshop in Japanese Syntax, 11-70, University of California at San Diego.
- Lasnik, H. (1999). Chains of Arguments. S. Epstein and N. Hornstein, eds., *Working Minimalism*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Lebeaux, D. (1988). *Language Acquisition and the Form of the Grammar.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Lebeaux, D. (1990). The grammatical nature of the acquisition sequence: Adjoin- α and the formation of relative clauses. J. de Villiers and L. Frazier, eds., *Language processing and language acquisition*, 13-82, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Lebeaux, D. (1998). Where does the Binding Theory Apply? NEC Research Institute Technical Report, Princeton.
- Mahajan, A. (1990). *The A/A' Distinction and Movement Theory.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- May, R. (1977). *The grammar of quantification.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- May, R. (1985). *Logical Form.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Partee, B. (1978). Bound Variables and Other Anaphors. D. Waltz, ed., *Proceedings of TINLAP 2*, 79-85, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Postal, P. (1971). *Cross-over Phenomena.* New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657-720.
- Riemsdijk, H. van and E. Williams. (1981). NP Structure. *The Linguistic Review* 1, 171-217.
- Saito, M. (1989). Scrambling as Semantically Vacuous A'-Movement. M. Baltin and A. Kroch, eds., *Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure*, 182-200, The University of Chicago Press.
- Saito, M. (1992). Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 69-118.
- Sportiche, D. (2001). Reconstruction, Binding and Scope. Ms., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Suh, J.-H. (1990). *Scope Phenomena and Aspects of Korean Syntax.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Wasow, T. (1972). *Anaphoric Relations in English.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Yang, D.-W. (1984). The Extended Binding Theory of Anaphors. *Theoretical Linguistics Research* 1, 195-218.

Young Sik Choi
Dept. of English Language and Literature
Soonchunhyang University
Asan, Chungnam
E-mail: youngsic@sch.ac.kr

Received: Dec. 1, 2004

Revised version received: Feb. 17, 2005

Accepted: Feb. 23, 2005