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_i overheard __ ]] did he_i 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? _________________]