

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.
 b. An operator chain (a sequence of copies) undergoes complementary deletion.
 c. 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.