



HAL
open science

**The Logic of Pronominal Resumption. By ASH ASUDEH, New York: Oxford University Press Inc (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics),
Nicolas Guillot**

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Guillot. The Logic of Pronominal Resumption. By ASH ASUDEH, New York: Oxford University Press Inc (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics),. Language, 2013. hal-01667752

HAL Id: hal-01667752

<https://hal.science/hal-01667752>

Submitted on 19 Dec 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Book Title: The Logic of Pronominal Resumption

Author: Ash Asudeh

Category of Submission: Full Review

Word Count: 2139

Date: April, 2, 2013

Author's name: Nicolas Guilliot

Affiliation: University of Nantes, LLING

Surface Address: University of Nantes, Department of Linguistics

Chemin de la Censive du Tertre, BP81227

44312 Nantes Cedex 3

France

E-mail address: nicolas.guilliot@univ-nantes.fr

The Logic of Pronominal Resumption. By ASH ASUDEH, New York: Oxford University Press Inc (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics), 2012, Pp. xix, 463, ISBN 978-0-19-920643-8, 45\$.

Reviewed by NICOLAS GUILLIOT, University of Nantes

MAIN ASSUMPTIONS AND OVERALL IMPRESSION. Ash Asudeh's book on "The Logic of Pronominal Resumption" is devoted to the description and formal representation of resumption across natural languages, a general phenomenon by which a pronoun occupies the base position of a syntactic dependency. Building empirically on a representative sample of languages (Irish, Hebrew, Swedish, Vata and English) and two types of syntactic dependency (unbounded dependencies and raising constructions, although only one chapter is specifically devoted to the latter), this book composed of thirteen chapters is on the one hand clearly inspired by traditional generalizations or distinctions made in the literature, but on the other hand brings a quite novel approach to resumption, coming mainly from the specific framework defended by the author, Lexical Functional Grammar associated with Glue Semantics (based on linear logic proofs). My overall impression on the book is that it is a very valuable reading for anyone interested in that phenomenon and especially for those interested in how resumption could be formalized.

Building on traditional literature on the topic (McCloskey (2002, 2005), Sells (1984)), the author uses three fundamental empirical generalizations as guiding principles for his own theory, which is clearly exposed in Chapter 1 and 2.

The first one is the distinction originating from Sells (1984) between true and intrusive resumptives, which the author restates as grammatically licensed versus processor resumptives (i.e. not fully grammatical, whose production would be related to processing).

The author also builds on a second well-established generalization in the literature based on a distinction between two lines of approach to resumption (distinguishing resumptive strategies across languages or within a same language), and this whatever the specific model adopted (HPSG, LFG, Generative Grammar): either a syntactic “base-generation” of both the resumptive pronoun and the detached (*wh*-) constituent, and a binding relation between the two, or a “movement” approach to resumption which equates the two elements to one syntactic function, the resumptive being more or less like a gap. These two approaches just follow from the duality of a resumptive construction, which interacts with both pronominal anaphora (binding processes) and movement or unbounded dependencies (see McCloskey (2005:96), Sharvit (1999), and also Rouveret (2011) for an extended discussion of the issue).

Building on these first two distinctions, the author ends up distinguishing between three kinds of resumption in unbounded dependencies: anaphora-like (true/grammatically licensed) resumptives — which he calls Syntactically Active Resumptives (SARs), gap-like (true/grammatically licensed) resumptives — Syntactically Inactive Resumptives (SIRs) in Asudeh’s terminology, and intrusive or Processor Resumptives. Chapter 2 restates traditional arguments to distinguish between these three uses of resumption, such as island sensitivity, weak crossover, reconstruction, or binding by a quantified antecedent. A very precise analysis is developed for each type of resumption throughout the book: Irish (Chapter 7) and Hebrew (Chapter 8) display SARs, whereas cases of resumption in Swedish (Chapter 9) and Vata (Chapter 10) are used to illustrate the analysis of SIRs. Processor Resumptives are discussed further in Chapter 11, with cases of resumption in English.

The last fundamental generalization that the author uses (borrowed from McCloskey (2002)) relies on the observation that resumptive pronouns are just ordinary pronouns, and that both should make strictly equivalent contributions. The author uses this generalization as

the starting point of his theory of resumption. But the main originality of his theory of resumption is undoubtedly the correlation with resource sensitivity, and more precisely the assumption that resumptive pronouns constitute a resource surplus (compared to gaps) in semantic composition, thus requiring some managing or consuming device. The general intuition is that the difference between each kind of resumption (SIRs, SARs and Processor Resumptives) resides in whether and how it can manage/consume the resource surplus created by the resumptive, through specific properties given to the complementizer system of the language. The intuition is first developed in Chapter 5 and 6, where the author makes an instructive discussion on different types of logics and on the resource sensitivity of natural language, before arguing that it should therefore be formalized through the use of a resource logic. A valuable contribution of the book can be found in the introduction of the framework (Lexical Functional Grammar and Glue Semantics) which is clearly exposed in Chapter 3 and 4, and makes it easier even for a non-expert reader to understand some details of the analysis. Independently of the introduction of the framework, Chapters from 7 to 11 illustrating each kind of resumption contain precise representations of LFG structures and semantic proofs.

Having stated my overall impression on the book, I now would like to discuss further several points which on the one hand bring strength to the book but on the other hand also raise some conceptual or technical questions.

ON RESOURCE SENSITIVITY. One major originality of the author's theory of resumption relies on the resource sensitivity hypothesis, i.e. the fact that the resumptive pronoun contribution creates a resource surplus (compared to a gap which just corresponds to nothing in the framework defended by the author), and therefore needs to be consumed and licensed (by the complementizer system in his theory). Although I find completely justified the idea of relating different types of resumption to different properties of the complementizer system, its formalization in terms of resource-surplus (resumptive) and consumer (complementizer) gives

the impression that resumption is unexpected in natural language, compared to gaps. In other theoretical frameworks, and especially the ones which consider gaps as bound variables (such as Generative Grammar), the occurrence of resumptive pronouns instead of gaps comes as no surprise, as a bound variable interpretation is clearly one of the possible interpretations of pronouns in natural language, hence confirming McCloskey (2002)'s generalization that resumptive pronouns are just ordinary pronouns.

And even if the formalization of this Resource Management Theory of Resumption is quite convincing, one aspect remains puzzling: the fact that the complementizers licensing resumption (in the case of SARs or SIRs) end up contributing a lot in the semantic composition (up to three meaning constructors), and at different stages of the semantic proof. On the one hand, as the author states, natural language is resource-sensitive in the sense that elements of combination in grammars cannot be freely reused or discarded. But on the other hand, the lexical entries of these complementizers have more than one use in the sense that they contribute several meaning constructors (for example one that allows semantic combination between the relative clause and the antecedent, and another one that consumes the semantic surplus coming from the resumptive pronoun). I understand that the properties of the framework make that possible, but it just seems surprising for a non-expert reader, especially in the context of the resource sensitivity hypothesis.

COMPARING WITH THE GENERATIVE APPROACH. One interesting aspect of the book is the comparison with the Generative Approach. Very regularly, the author compares his own take on the phenomenon with the way it is conceptualized and formalized in the Generative literature. One good thing is that such comparison makes easier for the reader to understand the analysis within the LFG-Glue Semantics framework (especially in Chapter 5 when the author compares his view on the Resource Sensitivity Hypothesis with similar principles in Generative Grammar, such as the Theta Criterion, the Projection Principle or the Principle of

Full Interpretation). Another good thing is that it clearly shows some weaknesses in parts of the Generative approach to resumption (for example in the case of SIRs traditionally analyzed as the spell-out of gaps in Generative Grammar). However, some of the arguments given against the Generative Approach are not so compelling to me. For example, the author compares his analysis of complementizer patterns in Irish relative clauses (for example $[_{CP} \dots aN \dots [_{CP} aL \dots _]]$) with the one proposed in McCloskey (2002), which he discards on the basis that semantic composition in intermediate positions could not be handled with such an analysis (as the embedded CP would end up denoting a predicate instead of a proposition). One thing that makes it easier a priori in the author's framework is that the relativizer (which basically composes the relative clause with the relative head) comes from the relative-CP rule, and is independent from lexical properties of the complementizer system. However, I think that several propositions seem reasonable in the Generative framework to account for the general idea that aL is related to movement, and aN to binding, especially if the Operator is not itself the lambda-abstractor. In a case like $[\dots aL \dots _ aL \dots _]$, each movement step could be associated with lambda-abstraction, with the operator left uninterpreted (schematic representation: $[Op \lambda_1. \dots [_{CP} t_1 [\lambda_2. \dots t_2]]]$). Notice that the embedded CP denotes a proposition, as expected. In a case like $[\dots aN \dots aL \dots _]$, the lower movement step creates lambda-abstraction, while the upper lambda-abstraction comes from binding, as independently needed for base-generated resumption (schematic representation: $[Op \lambda_1. \dots [_{CP} pro_1 [\lambda_2. \dots t_2]]]$)¹.

ON PROCESSOR RESUMPTIVES. My last comment is related to the author's analysis of intrusive pronouns as not fully grammatical Processor Resumptives. I found this idea both intuitive and at the same time quite problematic in some ways. Intuitive in the sense that it is true that resumption in English or French is highly related to production (except if we consider

¹ Or you could state that the Operator performs lambda-abstraction only when inserted to bind something, i.e. when there is no movement.

dislocation in French as a resumptive construction). The author gives two main reasons to distinguish such resumptives from true/grammatical resumptives (SIRs/SARs). One argument relies on grammaticality judgments, and more precisely the fact that speakers just tend to consider them as ungrammatical. The second argument goes back to Sells (1984) who gives several tests to argue that intrusive pronouns in English do not pattern like bound variables (for example, the fact that they could not be bound by quantifiers like *every* or *each*). But does this mean that they should be excluded from the grammar?

What this second argument shows is that such cases of resumptives do not seem to correspond to classical bound variables. But nothing prevents the resumptive from being interpreted as E-type, which should be another possible interpretation of the resumptive pronoun if we take McCloskey's generalization seriously. And these intrusive pronouns are very good candidates for such interpretation as they cannot be related to these quantifiers resisting E-type interpretation (*each* or *every*). If such cases are indeed related to an E-type phenomenon (see Guilliot & Malkawi (2011) for an analysis of resumption related to E-type), should we really consider them as not fully grammatical, although they just seem to reflect another property of ordinary pronouns?

As for the first argument about grammaticality judgments, it is true that many constructed examples with resumptives, especially the ones testing resumption as a saving device (in strong islands), are not considered as grammatical by native speakers, casting doubt on a general theory of resumption based on Last Resort. I completely agree with the author on that. But at the same time, such (un)grammaticality judgments should be used carefully as may be induced by many factors: sociolinguistic factors, competition with a more standard construction, influence of the norm. Take other constructions in French such as *c'est qui qui...* ("it is who who...") instead of *qui est-ce qui...* ("who is it that"), or *la voiture à ma sœur* instead of *de ma soeur* ("the car of my sister"), which are produced systematically, but would

not be judged as grammatical by the same speakers. Does it mean that our grammar should not generate them? And what about a model for which the distinction between grammar and production or parsing constraints is not so clear (see Cann, Kempson & Marten (2005)'s *Dynamic Syntax*)? Such cases of imbalance between production and grammaticality judgments thus raise very interesting and challenging questions about the relation between grammar and processing constraints. This goes beyond the author's analysis of such Processor Resumptives, which nevertheless has the great advantage of tackling the issue.

REFERENCES.

- CANN, RONNIE, RUTH KEMPSON and LUTZ MARTEN. 2005. *The Dynamics of Language: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- GUILLIOT, NICOLAS, and NOUMAN MALKAWI. 2011. Weak versus Strong Resumption: Covarying differently. In A. Rouveret ed., *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*, 395-423. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MCCLOSKEY, JAMES. 2002. Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, and the Locality of Operations. In S. D. Epstein and T. D. Seeley, eds., *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, 184-226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MCCLOSKEY, JAMES. 2005. Resumption. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Volume 3, 55: 94-117. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ROUVERET, ALAIN. 2011. Some Issues in the Theory of Resumption. In A. Rouveret ed., *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces*, 1-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SELLS, PETER. 1984. *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- SHARVIT, YAEL. 1999. Resumptive Pronouns in Relative Clauses. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 587-612.

Department of Linguistics, University of Nantes

Chemin de la Censive du Tertre, BP81227

44312 Nantes Cedex 3

France

[nicolas.guilliot@univ-nantes.fr]