

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. 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)b but not for (29)a.

(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)a, 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