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

(1) a. Which report that John revised did he submit?
   b. Which report that John was incompetent did he submit?
      Freidin (1986)

(2) a. *He believes the claim that John is nice.
   b. *He likes the story that John wrote.
   c. Whose claim that John is nice did he believe?
   d. Which story that John wrote did he like?
      Lebeaux (1988)

(3) a. *Which claim that John was asleep did he later deny
   b. Which claim that John made did he later deny
      Munn (1994)

(4) a. *Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to discuss
   b. Which claim [that John made] was he willing to discuss
      Chomsky (1993)

(5) a. *The claim that John was asleep, he was willing to discuss
   b. The claim that John made, he was willing to discuss
      Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)

(6) a. *The claim that John was asleep, he won't discuss
   b. The claim that John made, he won't discuss
      Postal (1997)

(7) The claim that John was asleep seems to him [t to be correct]
      Chomsky (1993)

(8) *I seem to him [t to like John]

(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
    b. [Which claim [that John made]] was he willing to discuss
    which claim
    c. For which x that John made, he was willing to discuss x claim
       Interpretation (?)

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

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

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

(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 was corrupt, he was unwilling to discuss
    b. That the director was corrupt, everyone knew that he would always be able to deny with a straight face
      Postal (1997)
II. On Lack of Reconstruction With A-Movement

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

(26)a. *Which claim that John was asleep did he later deny
b. *Which claim that John made did he later deny

(27) Later than what, one might ask?

(28) *Whose claim that John is nice did he believe?

(29) Susan: John is nice.
Mary: John is nice.
John: I believe Susan but I don't believe Mary.

(30) Which ['pro'] report that John was incompetent did he submit?

(31) What if the complement/relative asymmetry with WH-movement is illusory. How problematic is that for the theory?

(32)a. (9)a vs. b is arguably just a stipulation, as is (9)c.
b. (15) is clearly a stipulation.

(33) If anything, then, lack of that asymmetry would 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.)

(34)a. The Projection Principle requires that heads and their arguments, and the arguments of these heads, and so on, must be present in the base.
b. Adjuncts need not be present in the base.
c. 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.

(35) The claim that John, was asleep seems to him, to t be correct

(36) Lexical material is inserted only in the head position of an A-chain. Lebeaux (1988); Lebeaux (1990)

II. On Lack of Reconstruction With A-Movement

(37) "[Reconstruction] is a consequence of operator-variable constructions driven by II, a process that may (or sometimes must) leave part of the trace - a copy of the moved element - intact at LF..." Chomsky (1995)

(38) "That reconstruction should be barred in A-chains is thus plausible on conceptual grounds."

(39) *John, expected [him] to seem to me, [it to be intelligent]!

(40) "...under reconstruction the violation of Condition B should be eliminated, with him interpreted in the position of t..."

(41)a. (it seems that) everyone isn't there yet
b. Everyone seems [t not to be there yet]
c. I expected [everyone not to be there yet]

(42) "[the lack of wide scope for negation in (41)b] indicates that there is no reconstruction to the trace position..."

III. Quantifier Lowering?

(43) Some politician is likely to address John's constituency

(44) "[the ambiguity might than fall under theme-rheme properties, the 'wide scope' quantifier being a theme or topic."

(45) On the first reading, the speaker has a particular individual in mind (a politician, in this instance), but, for some discourse reason or other, does not identify that individual. On the second reading (the 'lowered' one), the speaker does not have any particular individual in mind. The ambiguity might than fall under theme-rheme properties, the 'wide scope' quantifier being a theme or topic.

(46) Some politician addressed John's constituency
a. ...namely Rockefeller
b. ...I can tell by all the balloons and flags on the green

(47) Someone is likely to clean the blackboard
(48) Someone cleaned the blackboard
a. ...namely, Joe the maintenance man
b. ...I have no idea who, but the board was covered with phrase structure trees last night, and is now bare

(49)a. No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime *
b. It was proven that no large Mersenne number is prime

(50)a. Noone is certain to solve the problem
b. It is certain that noone will solve the problem

(51)a. Every coin is 50% likely to land heads
b. It is 50% likely that every coin will land heads

(52)a. Every coin is 3% likely to land heads
b. It is 3% likely that every coin will land heads

(53)a. A hippocryph is likely to be apprehended
b. It is likely that a hippocryph will be apprehended

(54)a. A hippocryph is anxious to be apprehended *
b. *It is anxious that a hippocryph will be apprehended

(55) Some linguist is anxious to solve the problem of quirky Case

(56) (55) can be appropriately uttered whether or not the speaker has a particular linguist in mind. The second circumstance might involve, say, a report of an anonymous e-mail posting urgently requesting information about quirky Case.
Alternative: e-roles are 'checked' in the course of a derivation. The moved argument is itself a record of the crucial part of the history of its derivation. [On 0-roles as features, see, for example, Bošković and Takahashi (1995) and Lasnik (1995).]