

**Adjunct/Argument Asymmetries and Relative Clause types**  
Dominique Sportiche  
UCLA – Ecole normale supérieure, Paris – Institut Jean Nicod

There is a famous asymmetry regarding how Condition C interacts with wh-movement:

- (a) Which pictures **that FDR-j liked** did he-j sell t  
(b) \* Which pictures **of FDR-j** did he-j sell t

While (intended) coreference is fine in a, it is excluded in b.

There is only one proposal to deal with this asymmetry: Late adjunct merger, which meshes well with the copy theory of movement. The bold part is hypothesized to be late merged to *pictures* after wh-movement in a (as it is claimed to be an adjunct) but before movement in b where it is claimed to be a complement and thus required by *pictures*. This yields the following respective input representations to Condition C of the binding theory, drawing c-command distinctions by the proper name (FDR) making correct predictions:

- (a) Which pictures **that FDR-j liked** did he-j sell pictures  
(b) \* Which pictures **of FDR-j** did he-j sell pictures of FDRj

There are however several problems with such an account.

On the theoretical side, (i) why there should be an adjunct argument asymmetry is most unclear. Indeed, as long as a complement (or anything) is Late Merged by the interpretive interface, structures should be readily interpretable. (ii) Late Adjunct merger is radically countercyclic (undermining Chomsky's No Tampering Condition which has the virtue of deriving the c-command condition on movement) and there is no known theory or how it should be constrained. Thus, since condition C applies over unbounded domains - it seems to pay no attention to phase boundaries viz:

- (c) \*he-j says (that Mary thinks) that you saw John-j

Late adjunct merger must be assumed to be possible in arbitrarily deeply embedded positions viz.

- (d) OK which pictures of a portrait of a photograph **that FDR-j liked** did he-j sell

(Only the bold part, the only adjunct, would have to be late merged).

On the empirical side, the idea that the bold part in b is a complement seems untenable: As R.S. Kayne argues (and there exist no alternative analysis compatible with how structure building proceeds in minimalist approaches), *of* is best thought of as akin to a complementizer, the structure *pictures of FDR* as a relative structure with *pictures* its head, and thus the bold part in b is best viewed as an adjunct, if its counterpart in a is so viewed: the adjunct/argument asymmetry thus dissolves under analysis.

I will provide new (binding theoretic) reasons to think that the bold part in b is indeed a relative structure and propose a new analysis of the a/b asymmetry taking as point of departure Uli Sauerland's distinction between head raising relatives and matching relatives, motivated on interpretive grounds relevant to the argument/adjunct asymmetry.