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 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
(5) a. *The claim that John is [sic] asleep, he was willing to discuss
   b. The claim that John made, he was willing to discuss
      Chomsky (1993)

(6) a. *The claim that John was asleep, he won't discuss
   b. The claim that John made, he won't discuss
      Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)

(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.
   d. 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, he was willing to discuss x claim that John was asleep 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, 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)

(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? Kuno (1997)

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

b. Which claim that John, made did he, later deny Munn (1994)

(27) Later than what, one might ask?
(28) *Whose claim that John is nice did he 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.)
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