An argument that Merge and Move are intermixed

"Reconstruction effects": Either --

- (i) BT applies to an element before it moves; or
- (ii) BT applies to the copy left behind by movement.

(1) **BT(C)** reconstruction effects for complements of N inside *wh*-phrases

- a. *[Which picture of John_{*i*}] does he_{*i*} think we like $_$ best?
- b. *[Which claim [_{complement} that John_i is a fool]] did he_i resent ___ most?

(2) Absence of reconstruction effects for modifiers/adjuncts of N' inside *wh*-phrases

- a. [Which picture near John_{*i*}] does he_{*i*} think we like ____ best?
- b. [Which claim [rel. clause that John; overheard]] did he; resent most?
- c. [Which book [rel. clause that John_i bought __]] did he_i like __ best?

Account of the goodness of (2a-c):

- Step 1: construct which picture/claim/book and merge with V.
- Step 2: build the rest of the CP and do *wh*-movement of *which picture/claim/book*.
- Step 3: now Merge the modifier/adjunct to the *wh*-moved DP. Note that the modifier/adjunct never appears in a position c-commanded by *he*!

Account of the badness of (2a-c):

Subcategorization properties must be satisfied immediately in the course of tree-building. Merge of the complement of *picture/claim* cannot be delayed until after *wh*-movement

Can you do overt Merge of an adjunct after covert movement?

(3) Extraposition

a. We liked the pictures a lot near John's side of the table.b. Mary likes the book a lot that John bought.

Analysis: Covertly move the object up and to the right, then merge the adjunct! It looks like the adjunct moved on its own!

But:

Prediction — the phrase modified by the adjunct will have wide scope, because it covertly moved.

- (4) a. Mary wants to visit a city near Paris.
 [ambig: a particular city [wide scope] or any one will do [narrow scope]
 - b. Mary wants to visit a city very badly near Paris. [reading? _____]
- (5) a. Mary needs a book that describes Canada. [ambig]
 - b. Mary needed a book today that describes Canada. [reading?____]