

Please give a description of the research proposal to be undertaken during the Postdoctoral Fellowship. This should be prefaced by a copy of the abstract from the front page of the Application Form in up to 150 words. Then, in up to 1000 words (excluding any necessary bibliography, references, footnotes, charts etc), the proposal should clearly specify the context, research objectives and methodology of the proposed study, and set out a realistic research programme for the three years of the Fellowship. Applicants should be aware of the importance that the assessors place on the viability, specificity and originality of the research proposal, and of its achievability within the timescale.

Also, the research proposal should, if appropriate, address the question of vulnerable subjects. If you consider your subject is vulnerable (endangered or emerging), please ensure that you have provided an explanation in this Annex. The Academy is not prescriptive, and will consider all cases on their merits. Applicants may wish to view HEFCE's statements at www.hefce.ac.uk/aboutus/sis

Abstract: I will investigate the class of cases, known as *reconstruction*, where a phrase is interpreted in a more deeply embedded position than that in which it is pronounced. This discrepancy between loci of pronunciation and interpretation has crucial implications for the relationship between linguistic form and meaning. It is usually assumed (e.g. in Chomsky's 1993 copy theory) that movement is a prerequisite for reconstruction, yet we find evidence for reconstruction without movement in several cases, notably quantifier scope reconstruction into control complements. Reconstruction following movement is simply the most widespread class of reconstruction phenomena, but a proper subset of those phenomena can be found in non-movement environments such as control. In fact, implicational relations such as this are extremely widespread when reconstruction data are subjected to a fine-grained analysis. A major envisaged outcome is therefore the development of a grammatical theory designed to account elegantly for such patterns.

A central question in linguistic theory concerns the relationship between form and meaning: how do we account for apparent disparities between syntactic and semantic structures? *Reconstruction* is a term for one class of such disparities. On the orthodox approach to reconstruction (Chomsky 1993) elements are moved during a derivation, but in some ways are interpreted in the pre-movement position – in copy-theoretic terms, a lower copy is interpreted and a higher copy is pronounced. This simplifies our hypothesised form-meaning mapping, by complicating our notion of *form*: the syntactic form which is mapped to semantics becomes further removed from observable word order.

This approach predicts reconstruction to require a prior movement stage. However, this prediction is incompatible with the existence of cases of reconstruction without movement. One such case concerns scope reconstruction into control complements. Sentences such as (1) show scope ambiguities: on one reading, the choice of person may covary with the choice of books, whereas on the other reading, there is a single person who has tried to read everything.

- (1) Someone has tried [PRO to read every book].
 (1') [Every book_x [Someone_y [y has tried [PRO to read x]]]]

This could in principle be analysed as a case of long-distance quantifier raising, as in (1'): *every book* raises covertly from within the embedded clause to take wide scope. However, this would incorrectly predict that *every book* could scope over anything in the matrix clause. Instead, *every book* can only outscope *someone* and, arguably, the verb. If we add a further scope-taking element, such as *rarely* in (2), *every book* must take narrow scope with respect to it: we cannot interpret (2) as stating that for every sight in town, there is a visitor who rarely tries to see that sight.

- (2) A visitor rarely tries to see every sight in town.

The natural conclusion, then, is that *someone* in (1) reconstructs for scope into the embedded clause. However, *try* is a control predicate, not a raising verb. Although this may appear to support Hornstein's (1999) analysis of both control and raising as A-movement, further data militate against such a reductionist analysis. Specifically, control allows reconstruction in a proper subset of the cases where raising does. For example, an intervening quantifier blocks reconstruction into a control complement (3a), but frequently does not affect equivalent raising cases (3b).

- (3a) One student has promised some lecturer [to read every book]. *some>every>1
 (3b) One student seemed to some lecturer [to be reading every book]. some>every>1

Neeleman and Truswell (2006) show that similar discrepancies are found with many other properties which could potentially undergo reconstruction: A-movement reconstructs more readily than control for at least Condition C, interpretation as a Bound Variable Anaphor, and idiom formation. The BVA case is illustrated below: whereas many people can interpret the raising construction (4a) in such a way that the choice of best friend covaries with the choice of boy, this is impossible in (4b), a parallel control example. This shows that *his best friend* can reconstruct to a position where *his* can be interpreted as a bound variable in the raising, but not the control, case.

- (4a) His_i best friend seemed to every boy_i [to be wonderful].
(4b) *His_i best friend promised every boy_i [to meet him after school].

Moreover, similar relations hold between A-movement and A'-movement: for example, (5) shows that fewer quantifiers intervene for A' scope reconstruction than A-reconstruction.

- (5a) One student seemed to no-one [to be reading every book]. *no>every>1
(5b) It's [with one CHILD] that nobody said that every teacher should dance. no>every>1

Combining observations such as this and (3-4) above shows that control reconstructs in a proper subset of the circumstances in which A-movement reconstructs, and for a proper subset of the properties, and likewise for A-movement and A'-movement. Such implicational relations are rife in reconstruction data. A further example concerns the reconstructive potential of different quantifiers: negated quantifiers reconstruct for scope in a proper subset of the contexts in which universal quantifiers reconstruct, which, in turn, reconstruct in a proper subset of the contexts in which existential quantifiers reconstruct. For example, the existential *some child* can reconstruct to a position within the scope of *every book* in (6a), while this is not possible for the negative *no child* in (6b). In other words, (6b) cannot be interpreted as claiming that every book seemed not to be being read by anyone.

- (6a) Some child seemed to Bill [to be reading every book]. Every>some
(6b) No child seemed to Bill [to be reading every book]. *Every>no

As a final case, although space reasons prevent a demonstration here, note that Fox's (1999) generalisation that A'-reconstruction is obligatory while A-reconstruction (and, we might add, reconstruction in control dependencies) is optional also fits this general pattern: we find reconstruction at least as often in A'-dependencies as in the other cases.

This proposed project aims to develop a theory which divorces reconstruction from movement, but is sufficiently restrictive to capture such a multitude of implicational relations. However, a large amount of the empirical evidence presented here is either new, or newly synthesised. I therefore envisage an extensive initial data-gathering phase, aiming to validate, and hopefully expand upon, these patterns. The relevant data are partially reported in the literature, but require supplementation, at least initially through introspection and informal elicitation. As some of these phenomena are gradient, however, it may be profitable to explore gradient approaches to grammaticality (Bard *et al* 1996, Keller and Sorace 2005). Following this initial phase will come a period of theory development, which will doubtless provoke further cycles of empirical and theoretical elaboration. The primary theoretical challenge is to relate the different reconstructive properties of grammatical dependencies to other known distinctions among those dependencies. Inevitably, divorcing reconstruction from movement will complicate our model of the syntax-semantics interface, hopefully with concomitant simplification of the narrow syntactic theory. The goal of an explanatory and empirically adequate reconstruction theory is challenging, then, but will substantially enhance our understanding of the relationship between form and meaning.