Title: Moving out of IF-clauses: If an IF-clause is sentence initial....
Author: Heather Lee Taylor; affiliation: University of Maryland, College Park
Email: HLTaylor@umd.edu
INTRODUCTION: It is standardly claimed in the literature that extraction from IF-clauses of conditionals results in unacceptability. This follows from the CED (Huang, 1982) since IF-clauses are uncontroversially classified as adjuncts. In this paper, I show that in English and Spanish, extraction from an IF-clause is permissible if it is in sentence-initial position. Following Etxepare's (1996) proposal for extraction from IF-clauses in Spanish, I propose a derivation of conditionals that also adopts sideward movement (Nunes 1995, 2004) in order to explain the extraction facts without compromising the CED. In addition, the contrast in grammaticality between extraction from IF-clauses in sentence-initial versus sentence-final position provides empirical evidence supporting the sideward movement analysis of this data.

DATA: Extraction from a sentence-final IF-clause is unacceptable ((1)a). Surprisingly, extraction from an IF-clause in sentence-initial position is improved ((1)b). Etxepare (1996) notes that in Spanish, extraction from IF-clauses is acceptable ((2)a). Just as in English though, extraction from a sentence-final IF-clause in Spanish (2)b contrasts sharply with (2)a and is unacceptable.

(1)　　a. * I wonder what$_1$ you'll get dessert if you clean t$_1$
　　　　b. I wonder what$_1$ if you clean t$_1$ you'll get dessert

(2)a.Qué libro$_1$ crees que si Ricardo lee t$_1$ alguna vez abandonará la Lingüística de inmediato?
"Which book do you believe that if Ricardo ever reads he will give up linguistics immediately?"
b.*Qué libro$_1$ crees que Ricardo abandonará la Lingüística de inmediato si lee t$_1$ alguna vez
"Which book do you believe that Ricardo will give up linguistics immediately if he ever reads?"

This result is unexpected: 1) extraction from an IF-clause is an apparent violation of the CED, and 2) the syntactic position of an IF-clause should have no bearing on its status as an adjunct. How then are the contrasts in (1) and (2) explained?

ANALYSIS: Extepare (1996), following the proposals of Nunes (1995, 2004) and Hornstein (2001), proposes that extraction from IF-clauses is permissible via sideward movement. Sideward movement permits extraction from adjuncts without violated the CED by defining an adjunct island as one that has already been adjoined. Several key principles limit sideward movement, one of which is important for this proposal: at any given point in the derivation, only one tree can be extended. Iatridou (1991) provides empirical evidence that a sentence-final IF-clause is contained with VP; in the current theoretical framework, this same evidence supports a sentence-final IF-clause being adjoined to VP. She also provides evidence (Chomsky's 1977 standard tests of A'-movement, variable binding requiring reconstruction at LF) that IF-clauses are base-generated in this position and then A'-move to sentence-initial position, adjoined to IP. However if conditionals with sentence-initial IF-clauses must move to this position, there should be no contrast between (1)a&b or (2)a&b. But if the IF-clause is base-generated inside the main clause's VP, there is no successful way to extract from the IF-clause. **Attempt #1** - The IF-clause is built, and *what* moves to the edge of this tree. Next, the VP of the main clause is built. At this point, *what* must move out of the IF-clause and merge with *wonder*. This creates a third tree, the only one of the three that can now be extended. However, *you* is inside the matrix VP and has not checked case yet. The second tree must be extended. **Attempt #2 -** The IF-clause is built, and *what* moves to the edge of this tree. Next, the VP of the main clause is built. The IF-clause is merged with the VP, and the tree is extended until the selection of *wonder*. *What* is extracted from the IF-clause to merge with *wonder*, but this extraction violates the CED since the IF-clause is not adjoined to VP. The successful derivation of (2b) obtains by base-generating the IF-clause in sentence-initial position, adjoining it to IP of the main clause, the position that Iatridou demonstrates that a sentence-initial IF-clause A'-moves to. Because the adjunction site is IP, and not VP, *you* is able to check case in IP and this tree's growth can be exhausted before *what* is extracted, *wonder* and *what* are merged, and the IF-clause is adjoined to IP. I will also present data demonstrating that in expressions like (2)b the IF-clause has not moved.

Title: Moving out of IF-clauses: If an IF-clause is sentence initial....
Author: Heather Lee Taylor; affiliation: University of Maryland, College Park
Email: HLTaylor@umd.edu
References:

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On Wh-Movement. In Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal syntax,* 71-132. Academic Press: New York.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981 *Lectures On Government and Binding*.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 1998. Null complemetizers in Spanish. Revised version of a paper published in the *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology XXX-2, 1996 [1999], 469-496*. Ms. CNRS, 2002.

Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. UK, Blackwell Publishers.

Huang, C. T. James. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Iatridou, Sabine. 1991. *Topics on conditionals*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Nunes, Jairo. 1995. *The Copy Theory of Movement and Linearization of Chains in the Minimalist Program*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press Monograph.

Taylor, Heather Lee. 2003. *On* tough-*constructions and construal-as-movement*. MA thesis, Eastern Michigan University.