Condition C Reconstruction: Implications for LF
H. Lasnik

I. Condition C Complement/Adjunct Reconstruction Asymmetries (The 'Freidin-Lebeaux Effect')

(1) a. Which report that John$_i$ revised did he$_i$ submit?
    b. *Which report that John$_i$ was incompetent did he$_i$ submit?
                                                Freidin (1986)
(2) a. *He$_i$ believes the claim that John$_i$ is nice.
    b. *He$_i$ likes the story that John$_i$ wrote.
    c. *Whose claim that John$_i$ is nice did he$_i$ believe?
    d. Which story that John$_i$ wrote did he$_i$ like?
                                                Lebeaux (1988)
(3) a. *Which claim that John$_i$ was asleep did he$_i$ later deny
    b. Which claim that John$_i$ made did he$_i$ later deny
                                                Munn (1994)
(4) a. *Which claim [that John$_i$ was asleep] was he$_i$ willing to
       discuss
    b. Which claim [that John$_i$ made] was he$_i$ willing to discuss
(5) a. *The claim that John$_i$ is [sic] asleep, he$_i$ was willing to
       discuss
    b. The claim that John$_i$ made, he was willing to discuss
                                        Chomsky (1993)
(6) a. *The claim that John$_i$ was asleep, he$_i$ won't discuss
    b. The claim that John$_i$ made, he$_i$ won't discuss
                                        Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)

(7)   The claim that John$_i$ was asleep seems to him$_i$ [$_{IP}$ t to be
       correct]   Chomsky (1993)
(8)   *I seem to him$_i$ [t to like John$_i$]

(9) a. The 'Extension Condition': structure must be built
       strictly cyclically.
    b. Adjuncts are exempt from the Extension Condition; relative
       clauses are adjuncts.
    c. "Reconstruction" is essentially a reflex of the formation
       of operator-variable constructions.
    d. An operator chain (a sequence of copies) undergoes
       complementary deletion.
    e. Condition C is an LF requirement.   Chomsky (1993)

(10)a. [[Which claim][that John made]] was he willing to discuss
       ~~which claim~~   PF
    b. [[Which [t ~~claim~~]][that John made]] was he willing to
       discuss [~~which~~ [t claim]]   LF
    c. For which x that John made, he was willing to discuss x
       claim   Interpretation (?)

OR?

(11) a. [[Which claim][that John made]] was he willing to discuss
~~which claim~~   PF
b. [[Which claim][*t*]][that John made]] was he willing to
discuss [[~~which claim~~][*t*]]   LF
c. For which x, x a claim that John made, he was willing to
discuss x   Interpretation (?)

(12) a. Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to
discuss ~~[which claim [that John was asleep]~~   PF
b. [Which [*t* ~~claim [that John was asleep]~~] was he willing to
discuss [~~which~~ [*t* claim that John was asleep]   LF
c. For which x, he was willing to discuss x claim that John
was asleep   Interpretation (?)

BUT CRUCIALLY NOT

(13) a. Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to
discuss ~~[which claim that John was asleep]~~   PF
b. [[Which [*t* ~~claim~~]] [that John was asleep]]] was he willing
to discuss [[~~which~~ [*t* claim]] ~~that John was asleep~~]]   LF
c. For which x that John was asleep, he was willing to
discuss x claim   Interpretation (?)

OR

(14) a. Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to
discuss ~~[which claim that John was asleep]~~   PF
b. [[[Which claim][that John was asleep]]] *t*] was he willing
to discuss [[~~which claim that John was asleep~~]*t*]   LF
c. For which x, x a claim that John was asleep, he was
willing to discuss x   Interpretation (?)

(15) "...preference principle for reconstruction: Do it when you
can (i.e., try to minimize the restriction in the operator
position)."

II. Concerns About the Generalization

(16) Which piece of evidence that John was guilty did he
successfully refute?
(17) The widespread belief that John is incompetent, he deeply
resents
(18) Whose argument that John was incorrect did you show him?
(19) How many arguments that John's theory was correct did he
publish?
(20) This argument that John's theory is correct, he is now
ready to publish.
(21) Which proof that Mary's theory is superior to John's did
she present?
(22) Mary's attempt to hire John's student, he heartily
endorsed.
(23) John's request to attend Mary's lecture, she immediately
granted.

(24) a. The claim that the director$_i$ was corrupt, he$_i$ was
     unwilling to discuss
     b. That the director$_i$ was corrupt, everyone knew that he$_i$
     would always be able to deny with a straight face
                                        Postal (1997)

(25) a. Whose allegation that John$_i$ was less than truthful did he$_i$
     refute vehemently?
     b. Whose claim that the Senator$_i$ had violated the campaign
     finance regulations did he$_i$ dismiss as politically
     motivated?   Kuno (1997)

(26) a. *Which claim that John$_i$ was asleep did he$_i$ later deny
     b. Which claim that John$_i$ made did he$_i$ later deny
                                                     Munn (1994)
(27)   Later than what, one might ask?

(28)   *Whose claim that John$_i$ is nice did he$_i$ believe?
                                                  Lebeaux (1988)
(29)   Susan: John is nice.
        Mary: John is nice.
       !John: I believe Susan but I don't believe Mary.

(30) Lydia Grebenyova's experiment (UMD undergrads, 2004):
(31) Two claims have been made about John's arrest: that John was
     arrested yesterday and that John was arrested a week ago.
     John has a lawyer, whose name is Bill
(32) Which specific claim that John had been arrested did Bill
     deny
(33) Which specific claim that he had been arrested did John deny
(34) Which specific claim that John had been arrested did he deny
(35) 6 of 7 subjects accepted both (33) and (34) on the
     coreferential reading.

(36) What if the complement/relative asymmetry with WH-movement
     is illusory. How problematic is that for the theory?
(37) a. (9)a vs. b is arguably just a stipulation, as is (9)c.
     b. The status of (15) is unclear.
(38)   If anything, then, lack of that asymmetry might be a
     'better' state of affairs. (The only mildly negative
     consequence, depending on your point of view, is that a
     potential argument for traces, i.e., copies, disappears.)

Bibliography

Barss, Andrew. 1986. *Chains and anaphoric dependence: On
     reconstruction and its implications*. Doctoral dissertation,
     MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
Belletti, Adriana, and Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and theta
     theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
Bošković, Željko and Daiko Takahashi. 1995. Scrambling and last
     resort. Ms. University of Connecticut, Storrs and City
     University of New York, New York.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. Categories and transformations. In *The minimalist program*, 219-394. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*, Vol. 1, ed. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 506-569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fox, Danny. 1997. Reconstruction, binding theory and the interpretation of chains. Ms. MIT.

Freidin, Robert. 1986. Fundamental issues in the theory of binding. In *Studies in the acquisition of anaphora*, Vol. 1, ed. Barbara Lust, 151-188. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Heycock, Caroline. 1995. Asymmetries in reconstruction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 547-570.

Kuno, Susumo. 1997. Binding theory in the minimalist program. Ms. Harvard University.

Lasnik, Howard. 1995. A note on pseudogapping. In *Papers on minimalist syntax, MIT working papers in linguistics* 27, 143-163.

Lebeaux, David. 1988. *Language acquisition and the form of the grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Lebeaux, David. 1990. Relative clauses, licensing, and the nature of the derivation. In *Proceedings of NELS 20*, 318-332. GLSA.

May, Robert. 1977. *The grammar of quantification*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: Its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Munn, Alan. 1994. A minimalist account of reconstruction asymmetries. In *Proceedings of NELS 24*. GLSA.

Postal, Paul. 1997. Strong crossover violations and binding principles. ESCOL97.