On Left-Branch Extraction (LBE) and Left-Branch Condition (LBC) effects

In this paper, mostly based on Korean (and English) data, I suggest (A) that at least in relation to A-bar movement, LBE is an instance of regular movement (cf. Szabolcsi (1984,1994), Boskovic (2005));¹ and (B) that unlike island effects, LBC effects should be considered derived by a PF condition, which interacts with a (feature-copy/spreading) process that applies at the time of merger with a sensitivity to lexical properties. I show that (A) and (B) correctly predict that LBC effects can be remedied via ellipsis/deletion (cf. Merchant (2001), Kato (2007); cf. also Grebenyova (2005)), and also that when the PF condition is not applicable, LBE is always available (in principle) whether or not ellipsis is involved.

Suggestion (A) is supported by Korean relative clauses. In Korean, the null operator of a relative clause allows (long-distance) LBE (cf. (1-2)), but the LBE cases exhibit island effects (cf. (3)), which suggests that in Korean the null operator moves overtly, allowing LBE.² In fact, relevant strong cross-over effects show up (4) and the across-the-board application is possible (5). In Korean, all the null operators seem to allow LBE: First, topicalized sentences exhibit the same pattern as relative sentences (relevant data will be given). Second, comparative data further confirm suggestion (A): As discussed in Choe (2008), Korean employs subcomparatives that do not exhibit the identity condition (cf. (6b)), and the fact that no strong cross-over effects show up (7a) unless the compared constituent is overt, as shown in (7b) (which can be considered a Condition C violation) suggests that the left-branched null degree operator should always move alone (unlike English where the whole compared constituent, overt or covert, moves so that strong cross-over effects may always show up (cf. Kennedy (2002))); island violation data like (8) also suggest that the movement is overt, which further shows (A) is the case. Furthermore, deeply-embedded left-branches may be extracted (9), which suggests that there is an "escape hatch" within a noun phrase (10a) so that movement may be local, as shown in (10b) (cf. Szabolcsi (1984)).

However, in Korean, when the left-branch is an overt operator, LBE is not possible, unless the whole phrase containing it moves (cf. (11a-b)). To explain the contrast between (11a) and (11b) under (A) (cf. (10)), I suggest that there is a process shown in (12), by which the operatorhood (specified as genitive resumptive pronoun) need not be "split" from show up (cf. Kennedy (2002))); island violation data like (8) also suggest that the movement is overt, which further shows (A) is the case. Furthermore, deeply-embedded left-branches may be extracted (9), which suggests that there is an "escape hatch" within a noun phrase (10a) so that movement may be local, as shown in (10b) (cf. Szabolcsi (1984)).

Given that the left-branched operators all trigger pied-piping in English, I suggest that all the operators in English, null or overt, trigger the process in (12).³ I thus predict that in English, LBC effects should always appear, unless they are remedied via ellipsis. The prediction seems to be borne out: The contrast discussed in Grebenyova (2005) can be explained: (17a) can be considered a violation of (13) (cf. how expensive a car), while (17b) can be considered remedied via ellipsis/sluicing. As predicted, island violations may not be "repaired" via ellipsis (18a vs. 18b).⁴ If the present approach is on the right track, then it should be the case that while LBC violations can be remedied only via ellipsis, island effects can be nullified under ellipsis via a resumptive-binding strategy. Thus, under the present approach, (19a-b) can be explained: In (19a), a resumptive-binding strategy is used so that who (the wh-phrase in English that can bind a genitive resumptive pronoun) need not be "split" from his, but (19b) is unacceptable since it is considered is a violation of (13); (19bii) is also unacceptable because whose is not the right wh-form which can "bind" a resumptive pronoun. However, it has been noted (especially in relation to DP-resumptive pronouns (cf. Merchant (2001) for example; cf. also fn.4)) that the availability of a resumptive strategy is not always linked to the possibility of "repairing" of island violations via ellipsis, but I leave the issue open here for further researches (cf. however McDaniel and Cowart (1999)).
Data:

(1) a. Phikaso-ka [t i chosangwha-lul] kuli-n (ku) yeca i
    Picasso-Nom portrait-Acc painted-C the woman
    'the/a' woman, who Picasso painted [t i portrait']  (lit.)
    'the/a' woman, who [t i mother] is great' (lit.)
    (Korean)

(2) [the/a] woman, who we believe Picasso painted [ t i portrait]  (Korean)

(3) *[the/a] woman, who John met [β a painter who painted [ t i portrait]]  (K) (β = complex NP)

(4) *[a painter, who {he/self}, i said that we like [ t i portrait]]  (K) (strong cross-over effects)

(5) a. the student, who I met [ t i parent] and you met [ t i friends]
   b. *the/a woman who [t i mother] is a painter and [t i father] is a writer (K) (ATB application)

(6) Chelswu-nun [Yenghi-ka {a}[Op+0]/(b)?[Op+nomwun-ul]] ssu-n kes-pota
    Chelswu-Top Yenghi-Nom           papers-Acc wrote-C more than many papers-Acc wrote
    'Chelswu wrote more papers than Yenghi wrote {a}[Op+0]/(b)?[Op+papers]}.' (lit.)  (the compared constituent may
    be overt or null, but the overt compared constituent (papers) is not preferred to be focused)

(7) *[cacintul-i i {a}[Op+0]/*[Op+haksayngtul-i}i hapkyekhalila-ko malha-n kes-pota] te manhun hapkyekhalas-
    selves-Nom (a) (b) students-Nom would pass-C said-C more than many students-Nom passed
    'More students, passed than selves, said {a}[Op+0]/(b)*[Op+students-i] would pass.'

(8) *[he wrote move novels than I met [β a writer who wrote (novels)]. (K) (β = complex NP)

(9) a. (the) student who [[[t i mother's] friend's] son] got the best grade
    b. (the) woman who [[[t i mother's] friend's] father's occupation] is President (K)

(10) a. (i) [ Op, X] ===> (ii) [Op, [ t i X]]
    b. [ [ [ Op, mother's] friend's] son] ===> [Op, [ [ t i [ t i mother's]] friend's] son]]

(11) a. *[who/whose] i do you think that Picasso painted [ t i portrait]?
    b. whose portrait do you think that Picasso painted [ t i ]?  (K)

(12) a. [X1 Opπ + X2π] ===> (b) [X1, Opπ + X2π]  (where the feature π of Op is "spread" to X2 under sisterhood)
(13) a PF condition: In (12b), [Opπ + X2π] may not be split from X2π (as they together form a PF unit).

(14) a. ku-ka [t i sacin-ul] cecikessta, ku yeca-uy,  b. na-nun ku-ka [t i sacin-ul] cecikessta-ko mitnuma, ku yeca-uy,
     he-Nom picture-Acc took, the woman-Gen I-Top he-Nom picture-Acc took-C believe the woman-Gen
     'He took [t i picture], the woman's i.' (lit.)   I believe he took [t i picture], the woman's, (lit.)

(15) *I met the person who took [t i picture], the woman's, (K)

(16) *The woman's, i believe he took [t i picture].   (K) (cf. (14b) and fn. 1)

(17) a. *She bought a rather expensive car but I can't remember how expensive [she bought [a t car]].
    b. She bought a rather expensive car but I can't remember how expensive [she bought [a t car]]. (sluicing data)
    ((5a-b) in Grebenyova (2005))

(18) a. He said he needed a detailed report, but wait till you hear how detained [he said he needed [a t report]].
    b. *She'll be angry if he buys an expensive car, but I don't know how [she'll be angry if he buys [a t car]].
    ((7a-b) in Grebenyova (2005)) ((a) = LBC violation; (b) = LBC and island violation)

(19) a. *Who, did he police say that [ finding [his i car]] took all morning? (cf. (65) in Merchant (2001:133))
    b. *Whose, did the police say that [ finding [(i) t/(ii) his i] car]] took all morning?

1) Cases like possessor-raising and (short-distance) scrambling behave differently from A-bar movement cases including long-distance
    scrambling, which suggest that they should be treated differently.
2) When the null operator is not a left-branched one, island effects may not show up, as discussed in the literature. As for such
    data, I assume that a resumptive pro/pronoun strategy can nullify island effects (cf. Ishii (1991) for example). The data like (3),
    however, suggest that the distribution of resumptive pros (covert pronouns) may be more restricted than that of resumptive pronouns
    so that resumptive pros may not be allowed in left-branched positions.
3) It seems that degree operators within AP/AdvP as well as left-branched operators of noun phrases trigger process (12) in English.
4) Given that no resumptive AP-pronouns are available in English, a resumptive-binding strategy may not be available for (18b).