

Condition A Reconstruction: Implications for LF (and SS)

H. Lasnik

- (1) Arguments, of increasing strength, against an S-Structure condition:
- (2)a. The condition *can* apply at LF alone.
 b. Furthermore, the condition sometimes *must* apply at LF.
 c. Furthermore, the condition must *not* apply at S-Structure. Chomsky, p. 192
- (3)a. John₁ wondered [[which picture of himself_{1/2}][Bill₂ saw t]]
 b. John₁ wondered [who₂ [t saw [which picture of himself_{*1/2}]]]
- (4)a. The students₁ asked [[what attitudes about each other_{1/2}][the teachers₂ had noticed t]]
 b. The students₁ asked [who₂ [t had noticed [what attitudes about each other_{*1/2}]]] p.205
- (5) The bad readings of (3)b and (4)b are ruled out at LF, under the assumption that LF movement is not of the entire wh-phrase. Then no appeal to S-Structure is required.
- (6) The ₂ readings of all the examples implicate the 'copy theory of movement'.
- (7) John wondered [[_{wh} which picture of himself]][Bill saw [[_{wh} which picture of himself]]]
- (8) Then, by an LF "operation akin to QR" we have (9) or (10), depending on the size of the QRed item.
- (9) John wondered [[[_{wh} which picture of himself][_{wh} t]][Bill saw [[_{wh} which picture of himself][_{wh} t]]]
- (10) John wondered [[which [_{wh} t picture of himself]][Bill saw [which [_{wh} t picture of himself]]]
- (11) With complementary deletion to produce an operator variable structure, we have:
- (12) John wondered [[[_{wh} which picture of himself][_{wh} t]][Bill saw [[~~_{wh} which picture of himself~~][_{wh} t]]]
- (13) John wondered [[which x, x a picture of himself][Bill saw x]]
- (14) John wondered [[which [~~_{wh} t picture of himself~~]][Bill saw [~~which~~ [_{wh} t picture of himself]]]
- (15) John wondered [[[which x][Bill saw x picture of himself]]]
- (16)a In (12), John is the antecedent of himself.
 b In (14), Bill is the antecedent of himself. p.206

- (17) John wondered [[which picture of himself][Bill took t]]
- (18) Himself in (17) can take John or Bill as antecedent, just as in the earlier examples, BUT only when took means 'pick up and walk away with'.
- (19) When took (pictures) means 'photograph' (the 'idiomatic reading'), Himself can only take Bill as antecedent, according to Chomsky.
- (20)a John wondered [[which x, x a picture of himself][Bill took x]]
 b John wondered [[[which x][Bill took x picture of himself]]]
- (21) "Having abandoned D-Structure, we must assume that idiom interpretation takes place at LF ..." p.207
- (22) "Thus, *take ... picture* can be interpreted as 'photograph' only if the phrase is present as a unit at LF - that is, in (20)b, but not (20)a."
- (23) This explains why in (20)a we can only have the nonidiomatic interpretation of *take*.
- (24) The students₁ asked [[what attitudes about each other_{*1/2}][the teachers₂ had t]]
- (25) Chomsky gives a parallel analysis here: have ... attitudes is a sort of idiom, so must be unified at LF.
- (26) "The conclusions follow on the crucial assumption that Condition A *not* apply at S-Structure... If Condition A were to apply at S-Structure, *John* could be taken as antecedent of *himself* in [(17)] and the later LF processes would be free to choose either the idiomatic or the literal interpretation, however the reconstruction phenomena are handled ..." p.207
- (27) "Thus, we have the strongest kind of argument against an S-Structure condition ... Condition A *cannot* apply at S-Structure." p.208
- (28) But there is now a near contradiction with the account of the Freidin-Lebeaux examples, as Chomsky observes (p.208).
- (29)a John₁ wondered [which picture of himself_{1/2}][Bill₂ saw t]
 b John₁ wondered [which picture of Tom₂][he_{1/*2} liked t]
- (30) In (29), the of phrase, being a complement, must reconstruct. This gives the right result for (29)a but not for (29)b.
- (31) The ₂ reading of (29)b is ruled out by the preference principle:

- (32) "... try to minimize the restriction in the operator position
..." p.209
- (33) Why "minimize the restriction"? Why not "maximize the restriction"? A speculation: When you minimize the restriction, you have QRed a smaller (and proper subpart) of what you would QR to maximize the restriction. Moving less is more economical than moving more (like the deduction of Procrastinate from economy).
- (34) To allow the ₁ reading of (29)b, we need it to be true that something makes the normally disfavored option necessary.
- (35) That something is the LF cliticization approach to anaphora:
- (36)a John self-wondered [which picture of t_{self}][NP saw [which picture of himself]]
 b John wondered [which picture of himself][NP self-saw [which picture of t_{self}]]
- (37)a [[which picture of α] t] $\alpha = t_{self}$ or *himself*
 b [which][t picture of α]
- (38) If we select the syntactic option (36)a then we cannot select the interpretive option (37)b (with $\alpha = t_{self}$).
- (39) That option requires deletion of [t picture of t_{self}] in the operator position, which would break the chain (*self*, t_{self}), leaving the reflexive without a θ -role at LF.
- (40) In short, if we take the antecedent of the reflexive to be *John*, then only the nonreconstructing option converges.
- (41) several pictures were taken t
- (42) the students asked [which pictures of each other] [t' were taken t by Mary]
- (43) "One possibility is that the trace of the A-chain enters into the idiom interpretation (and, generally, into θ -marking), while the head of the chain functions in the usual way with regard to scope and other matters." p.211
- (44) the claim that John was asleep seems to him [_{IP} t to be correct]
- (45) "... if "reconstruction" is essentially a reflex of operator-variable constructions, it will hold only for \bar{A} -chains, not for A-chains." p.205