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In contrast to reconstruction of A'-movement, which has been regarded as empirically justified, the status of A-construction is less clear. Re-examining the behavior of every in the Raising-to-Object (henceforth RTO) construction, Lasnik (1999) claims that A-movement does not necessarily leave a trace and that LF-reconstruction effects with every in RTO sentences result from failure to delete a lower copy. Based on the novel data of RTO where the apparent low behavior of the lower subject is limited to instances with a specific kind of determiners, I argue against this approach to reconstruction in RTO. Alternatively, I show that only when the determiner of the logical subject of the embedded predicate (the lower subject hereafter) is "shareable" in the sense of McCawley (1993) and Lin (2000), the low scope reading of the lower subject is possible, demonstrating that optional deletion of the lower copy in the construction is not a sufficient account for the data.

As argued in Postal 1974 and Lasnik and Saito 1991, the lower subject in a RTO sentence behaves like a matrix constituent with respect to Condition A, NPI licensing, and pronominal coreference, as shown in (1).

(1) The "high" binding behavior for the lower subject: (Postal 1974, Lasnik and Saito 1991)
   a. DA proved [two men to have been at the scene of the crime] during each other’s trial.
   b. The DA proved [no suspect to have been at the scene of the crime] during his trial.
   c. The DA proved [no one to have been at the scene of the crime] during any of the trials.

However, the examples like (2) show interactions between the lower subject and the embedded negation.

(2) a. I believe everyone not to have arrived yet. (every > not, not > every)
   b. I believe every Mersenne number not to be prime. (every > not, not > every)

Given (1)-(2), Lasnik (1999) states that the low-behavior of the lower subject is due to the deletion of the lower copy, to which the raised lower subject may reconstruct.

Under Lasnik's account, the low-reading of the lower subject with respect to the embedded negation (the low scope hereafter) is due to the failure of deletion of the lower copy. However, there is some data showing that such ambiguity in RTO sentences is not always observed. Consider (3), where all the examples are unambiguous, with the quantificational DP unambiguously taking scope over the embedded negation.

(3) a. I believe some students not to have arrived yet. (some > not, *not > some)
   b. I believe a student not to have arrived yet. (a > not, *not > a)
   c. I believe three students not to have arrived yet. (three > not, *not > three)

The contrast between (2) and (3) indicates that the possibility for the lower subject to have the low scope depends on the kind of the determiner of the lower subject: Every (and most, all as well) is compatible with the low scope of the lower subject, while the ones in (3) are not. Since the determiner of the lower subject in (3) is the so-called weak determiners (Milsark 1974), the relevant dichotomy might at first seem to coincide with the weak/strong distinction of determiners. However, as (4) and (5) below show, it is not the case.

(4) I believe many students not to have arrived yet.
   (many > not, not > many) --- weak but ambiguous

(5) I believe each student not to have arrived yet.
   (each > not, *not > each) --- strong but not ambiguous

This is reminiscent of another typology of determiners that cross-cuts the strong/weak dichotomy: The determiner-sharing construction like (6) is only possible with the set of determiners listed in (7), which contains the determiner found with the lower subjects with the low scope: Every, most, and many.

(6) Too many Irish setters are named Kelly, too many German shepherds are named Fritz, and too many Huskies are named Nanook. (McCawley 1993, Lin 2000)

(7) Shareable determiners: Strong: the, possessive DPs, each, every, most Weak: many, no, few, any

Based on those observations, I claim that the apparent low scope reading of the lower subjects involve the same mechanism as determiner sharing as proposed in Lin 2000. Specifically, I
propose the class of determiners allowing the low scope in RTO is situated in a position above vP and below T: (8).

(8) I believe [CP [TP not to every [vP student be honest]]]
(8) is evidenced by the fact that T-sharing is obligatory when the RTO sentences are posited in a gapping context. The data in (9) is only explained if the subject NP in the first member of the conjoined V is raised to the position of most, as in (10i). The subsequent raising of the entire DP at the edge of the embedded CP (10ii) ensures the accusative Case for the lower subject (Bruening 2001, Hiraiwa 2002).

(9) a. Mary believes most boys to be naughty, and most girls (*to be) noisy.
   b. Mary believes many boys to be naughty, and many girls (*to be) noisy.
(10) ... [CP [TP to [DP most boys] [VP [VP1 boys_copy be naughty] and [VP2 girls be noisy]]]]
If the proposal is on the right track, then the prediction is that D/T-sharing is lacking in gapped RTO sentences with the other class of determiners. As shown in (11), the prediction is borne out.

(11) *Mary believes three boys to be naughty, and three girls to be noisy.
Given the obligatory high behavior of the lower subject with this class of determiners (cf. (3)), I assume that they are unambiguously situated in the matrix clause.

Summarizing, I showed that the low-behavior of the lower subject in the RTO construction is observable only with the lower subject with the sharable determiner, and argued against the optional trace-deletion approach to the data.

An implication of this approach is that it gives a parametric account for the cross-linguistic differences in RTO, reducing it to parametric differences in D. English, with two kinds of determiners, have two different strategies for RTO sentences depending on the choice of the determiner (11)-(2): In contrast, if a language lacks D which may induce determiner-sharing structure by raising, it should uniformly adopt the non-sharing, base-generation approach, which is the case of Japanese: As shown in (12), the logical subject of the lower predicate in the RTO construction can be spelled out as a pronoun coreferential with a matrix constituent, suggesting the base-generation approach to the RTO sentence (cf. Hoji 1991).

(12) Mary-wa John-2 no koto-o [kurasu-de kare2-ga itiban baka-da to]
   Mary-Top John-Gen fact-Acc class-in he-Nom most fool-Cop C
   omot-te i-ru.
   think-ing be-Pres
Lit. 'Mary thinks of John that he is the most stupid in the class.' (From Saito 1983)
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