This talk argues against copy as a syntactic operation. The copy theory of movement (CTM) assumes that movement contains two more steps than merge: copy and PF-deletion of the silent copy. One problem of CTM concerns the assumed PF-deletion, which Chomsky (2000: 114) denies without an explanation: "copy theory is the simplest version of transformational grammar, making use of Merge, not Merge followed by an operation that deletes the original". If the assumed copy operation created two copies that were equal with respect to phonological features, and the two copies were sent to PF, deletion of either of them at PF should be motivated phonologically, rather than the assumptions such as only one copy can be interpreted at LF. However, we have not seen any phonological evidence to restrict the deletion to the lower copy. Alternatively, if the assumed copy operation had the effect that only the copy rather than the original could have phonological features, the operation would violate the Inclusiveness Condition, which bars introduction of new elements (features) in the course of computation (Chomsky 2001: 2). Another problem of CTM is the paradox of the locality of feature-checking, noted by Gaertner (1998, 1999). If we adopt Chomsky’s (2001) mutual feature-valuation theory of checking between x and y, we cannot explain the double-checking of the same features of y by the two links of a single chain: a local checking against one copy of x and a remote checking against another copy of x. Chomsky (1995:381) notices the problem, without giving an account.

We propose a remerge theory of movement (RM): displacement effect is derived when the element under merge comes from a well-built structure rather than from Array. Thus the element undergoes remerge. The CTM eliminates a type of element, trace, at the cost of adding a new type of operation, copy. The absence of trace in RM, however, follows directly from merge, which does not leave a trace. Since (re-)merge leaves no category behind, there is nothing to delete in the source site. Thus the above PF-deletion problem does not occur. Moreover, since there is no copy at all, the above feature-checking paradox does not occur either. Properties of RM: (I) RM avoids redundancy. 1st, since there is no copy operation, we do not need those constraints on copy and deletion proposed by Pesetsky (1998) and Hornstein (2001: 100). 2nd, since movement is remerge, it shares constraints with initial merge on both target and source. Extension Condition rules out not only downward movement, but also upward movement and merge which do not extend the structure on the top (except head movement). Moreover, merge cannot combine elements which belong to another Array/phase, nor can movement start from a position internal to another spelled-out phase. 3rd, the so-called “Chain Uniformity Principle” (Chomsky 1994: 18) should not be restricted to movement. The positions where certain type of element are not allowed to land by the principle are also the positions where the same type of element are not allowed to merged. (II) RM captures the expensive nature of movement without a global consideration. If there is no available element in the Array to satisfy the relevant local feature-checking requirement, remerge of a qualified element from a well-built structure is the only choice. If there is an available element in the Array to do the job, remerge of an element from a well-built structure is illegal, since syntax has no way to deal with the unused element in the Array. The choice between merge and remerge is thus decided within the syntax of each phase. In contrast, if we claim that movement costs more because it requires a post-copying PF-deletion while merge does not (as in Kitahara 1995), we evaluate the two choices beyond syntax, since PF-processes count. (III) RM can cover reconstruction effects. Re merge extends a structure, but never demolishes the structure which has already been built. The element undergoes remerge has multiple positions rather than multiple copies. Therefore, it is possible that its source and the target position feed different interfaces. We analyze three cases of apparent copy configurations, showing that they are not derived by a copy operation in syntax: the predicate clefting in Creole languages (1)(2), the verb-copying construction in Chinese (3), and the wh-copying construction in languages such as German (4). In addition, we argue that Watambe’s (2000) feature-copying operation does not differ from Chomsky’s Agree in situ empirically, that the copy assumptions on VP-ellipsis (Williams 1977, Donati 2000) are wrong considering sloppy reading and non-identity ellipses (Potsdam 1997, Johnson 2001), and that XP-splits in languages such as German can be derived by complete base-generated topic & distributed-deletion rather than Fanselow & Cavar’s (2001) copying & distributed-deletion. Finally, we argue that in processing of conjunction constructions, the preference of identical structures between the two conjuncts (Frazier & Clifton 2001), including the parallelism effects in VP ellipsis, is the result of the general law of inertia. Thus no syntactic copy operation is involved.
(1) a. Se fèk akite h. fèk akite fle yo. (Haitian. Larson & Lefebvre 1991)
   It is just buy he just buy flower.
   'It is just buy flowers that he did (not, e.g. just sell).’ [the "copy" is not a constituent]

   It is eat bread John eat bread.
   'It is eat that John did to the bread (not, e.g. baking).'

(2) a. ta du na ma du nabo e buki. (Papiamentu. Muyssken & Law 2001)
   give 1SG-PAST give-2SG-DRT book
   'I have really given you the book.'

b. *ta a du na ma du nabo e buki.
   be PAST give 1SG-PAST give-2SG-DRT book
   'You really gave the book to me.'

(3) a. Akiu mai (*-le) yinshao mai le san ping Kele.
   Akiu buy PRF beverage buy-PRF three bottle Coca-Cola
   'Buying beverage, Akiu bought three bottles of Coca-Cola.'

b. ni kan dianying kan-mei-kan-gou?
   you see movie see-not-see-enough
   'Have you seen enough movies?'

(4) a. Wen denkst du wen sie (*wen) liebt?
   Who do you think that she loves?
   b. Was denkst du wen sie (*wen-*was) liebt?
   'Who do you think that she loves?'

[No tense (2b), asp (3a), A-not-A (3b) in the upper copy. It’s unexpected from either Hornstein (01:
67) that 2 copies are equal or Chomsky (95) that the lower copy is invisible in the computation]

b. *ni kan dianying kan-mei-kan-gou?
   ni kan-mei-kan dianying kan-gou?
   you see movie see-not-see-enough see-not-see movie see-enough

[In neither the wh-expletive (4a) nor the wh-copying construction (4b) a wh-form occurs in situ, and
an operator intervenes between the two wh-forms (4c). The latter construction is a subcase of the
former (cf. Kim 2001: 94), and there is no copy operation.]

Sternefeld (eds.) Competition in Syntax, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 107-150.
Johnson, K. 2001 What VP Ellipsis Can Do, and What it Can’t, but not Why. M. Baltin & C. Collins
(eds.) The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory. Blackwell. 439-479.
Kitahara, H. 1995 Target Alpha: Deducing Strict Cyclicity from Derivation Economy. LI 26, 47-77.
Nunes, J. 1995 The copy theory of movement and linearization of chains in the minimalist program.
Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
Pesetsky, D. 1998 Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In P. Barbosa et al. (eds.) Is
Watanabe, A. 2000 Feature copying and binding: evidence from complementizer agreement and
Williams, E. 1977 Discourse and Logical Form. Linguistic Inquiry 8, 101-139.