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(1) [They] seem to [him] [to like John]
(2) In (1), him evidently c-commands TP, since him and John must be disjoint in reference. Therefore, in the pre-raising structure, him c-commands they.
(3) [They] seem to [him] [to like John]
(4) "Why, then, does I [-T] in (3) attract the subject they of [embedded TP] rather than [him], which c-commands it, an apparent Relativized Minimality violation." Chomsky (1995, p.304)
(5) There are really two problems here:
   a. Why is they allowed to move over the c-commanding, hence closer, him?
   b. How is it that him, which is inside the PP to him, c-commands John in the first place?
(6) TP
   T
   ν
   PP
   to him seem TP
   ... they ...
(7) Kitahara (1997) proposal: In (6), him does not c-command into the embedded TP (because of the dominating PP). Hence, RM (in whatever form) won't prevent they from being attracted by matrix T.
(8) What of the Condition C effect?
   a. Condition C applies solely at LF.
   b. In the LF component "...FP[him] adjoins to the preposition to for the checking of Case features of him and to...and this covert feature movement allows the referential property of him to enter into a c-command relation with John."
(9) a The proposal is derivational in an interesting respect. Throughout the overt syntax, the object of the preposition does not c-command out of the PP. But as a consequence of an LF operation, c-command becomes possible.
   b A raising operation creating a new c-command configuration relevant to Binding Theory is rather familiar:
   c Two linguists seem to each other [to have been given good job offers]
   d And the same has been proposed for covert raising:
   e There arrived two knights on each other's horses SS
   f Two knights arrived [to each other's horses] LF
   g An even more derivational version of Binding Theory, proposed by Lebeaux in a series of writings (Lebeaux (1988); Lebeaux (1991); Lebeaux (1994)), would also be compatible with the facts so far:
   h a Condition A can be satisfied at any point in the derivation (as in Belletti and Rizzi (1988)).
   i Conditions B and C must be satisfied everywhere in the course of the derivation.
(10) a Which claim that John made did he later deny?
   b *Whose claim that John made did he later deny?
   c The Projection Principle requires that heads and their arguments, and the arguments of these heads, and so on, must be present in the base.
   d Adjuncts (including relative clauses) need not be present in the base.
   e Condition C is not earmarked for any particular level--it applies throughout the derivation, and marks as ungrammatical any configuration it sees, in which a name is c-commanded by a coindexed pronoun.
(11) The claim that John was asleep seems to be correct.
   a Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to discuss?
   b Which claim [that John made] was he willing to discuss?
(12) "Reconstruction" is essentially a reflex of the formation of operator-variable constructions. Chomsky (1993)
(13) Lexical material is inserted only in the head position of an A-chain.
(23) TP
    |         |
    v        v
    PP V' ---
    to him seems TP

[the claim that John was asleep to be correct]

(24) A simple extension of Kitahara's theory: In (23) him does not c-command John, so the lack of Condition C reconstruction is straightforwardly explained.

(25) On the other hand:

(26) This claim strikes me as correct
(27) *Mary strikes him as angry at John

(28) TP
    |         |
    v        v
    DP V' ---
    me strikes SC

[this claim] as correct

(29) The Kitahara-Lebeaux hybrid suggested above evidently fails for (27); this time there is no PP preventing c-command by the experiencer.

(30) Further, there is substantial evidence that LF feature movement, unlike overt phrasal movement, does not create new Binding Theoretic configurations. (den Dikken (1995); Lasnik (1995); Lasnik (1997); etc.)

(31) a There is/*are a man here
   b There are/*is men here

(32) a Some linguists seem to each other [t to have been given good job offers]
   b *There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists given good job offers]

(33) a The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other's trials
   b *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene] during each other's trials

(34) The claim that John was asleep seems to him [t, t to be correct]

(35) Condition C is just an LF (or interface) requirement.

(36) ?? No reconstruction with A-movement.

(37) The absence of RM effects in these constructions continues to be mysterious.

(38) *Jean semble à Marie [t avoir du talent]
    Jean seems to Marie to have talent Chomsky (1995, p.305)

(39) "The status of the English constructions still remains unexplained, along with many other related questions." Chomsky (1995, p.306)

(40) a *John seems to t that Mary is clever 
    b *John is seemed to t that Mary is clever

(41) a John strikes t that Mary is clever 
    b John is struck t that Mary is clever

(42) Evidently, the Case of the experiencer in these constructions is inherent. We want this to somehow entail that the experiencer doesn't count as a closer attractee either because it cannot, in principle be attracted; or because the experiencer doesn't c-command the complement subject.

(43) As for the absence of [forced] reconstruction with A-movement, here I offer the speculation that I offered for other reasons in one of my 1994 Numazu lectures:

(44) A-movement leaves no copy. (Ultimately, though, as discussed in my 1998 Numazu lectures, and contrary to standard assumptions, there is very little evidence for forced reconstruction under any circumstances.)
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