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1. Where do the Binding Conditions Apply?

(1) Which book that John read did he like
(2) *He liked every book that John read
(3) *I don't remember who thinks that he read which book that John likes
(4) John said that Bill had seen HIM
(5) John wonders which picture of himself Mary showed to Susan
(6) *John wonders who showed which picture of himself to Susan
(7) There is a man in the room
(8) A man is in the room
(9) There arrived two knights on each other's horses
(10) Two knights arrived on each other's horses
(11) I saw two men on each other's birthdays
(12) *Such examples indicate that [overt] movement and movement in the LF-component have quite different effects with respect to the binding theory. This theory applies properly after syntactic movement, but each rule of the LF component converts S-structures to which the binding theory applies correctly to LF-representation to which it applies incorrectly. [Chomsky (1981, p. 197)]
(13) Some linguists seem to each other [to have been given good job offers]
(14) *There seem to each other [to have been some linguists given good job offers]
(15) a Some defendant seems to his lawyer to have been at the scene
b *There seems to his lawyer to have been some defendant at the scene
(16) A man is likely to be here
(17) There is likely to be a man here
(18) Many linguistics students aren't here
(19) There aren't many linguistics students here
(20) The associate of there always displays 'low' behavior, while an overtly moved NP displays 'high' behavior.

2. More on Feature Movement and (Lack of) Binding

(21) a There is/*are a man here
b There are/*is men here
(22) a The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other's trials
b *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene] during each other's trials
(23) A man is likely to be here

24. The ECM subject undergoes raising. The associate of there must then undergo raising of a quite different sort.

3. Overt Raising to [Spec, Agr]

(25) The DA proved [no suspect to be at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(26) *The DA proved [there to be no suspect at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(27) The DA proved [no one to be at the scene] during any of the trials
(28) *The DA proved [there to be no one at the scene] during any of the trials
(29) The version of expletive replacement espoused in Chomsky (1991) — adjunction to there, rather than substitution for it — potentially makes the necessary distinction between NPs with high behavior and associates of there. The latter will adjoin to there, hence arguably will not be in the appropriate position to c-command the anaphors, NPs, etc.
(30) There aren't many linguistics students here
(31) Pictures of many students aren't here
(32) Pictures of few students are here
(33) There are few linguistics students here
(34) Many linguistics students aren't here
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(35) On May's and Chomsky's theory of adjunction, when α
adjoins to β, β becomes a segmented category, and α
c-commands anything β did prior to the adjunction.

(36) All else equal, movement should never be of an entire
syntactic category, but only of its formal features.

(37) Some linguists seem to each other [Ł to have been given
good job offers]

(38) There seem to each other [Ł to have been some linguists
given good job offers]

(39) a No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [Ł
to have been formulated]
b Some defendant seems to his lawyer [Ł to have been at
the scene]

(40) a •There seem to any philosophers [Ł to have been no good
linguistic theories formulated]
b •There seems to his lawyer [Ł to have been some defendant
at the scene]

(41) Un this kind of account, the elements of the theory of
anaphora are not merely formal features.

(42) "...the features adjoined to AgrO...have A-position
properties, c-commanding and binding in the standard
way." [Chomsky (1995a, p.272)]

(43) Thus, for all purposes (except scope), feature movement is
claimed to have the same consequences as NP movement.

(44) a [wpr AN [FF (linguists) α]]
b [wpr FF (linguists) [AN α]]

(45) "On reasonable assumptions, neither of these structures
qualifies as a legitimate binding-theoretic
configuration, with AN taking FF (linguists) as its
antecedent." [Chomsky (1995a, pp.275-76)]

(46) a [wpra AN [FF (two men) [S]]]
b [wpra FF [two men [AN [S]]]

(47) The accusative NP overtly raises to Spec of AgrO (with V
raising to a still higher head position). The licensing
is at LF, but as if at S-structure, since the only
relevant movement is overt. Covert movement, involving
merely formal features, is incapable of creating new
licensing configurations for anaphora etc.

4. Feature Movement and Control

(49) (?) There arrived three men (last night) without [PRO]
identifying themselves

(50) *I met three men (last night) without identifying
themselves

(51) John telling Mary about self's father

(52) John told Mary write article

(53) Three men arrived (last night) without PRO identifying
themselves

(54) Without PRO identifying themselves, three men arrived

(55) *Without identifying themselves, there arrived three men

(56) Someone seems to be available without PRO seeming to be
eager to get the job

(57) *There seems to be someone available without PRO seeming to
be eager to get the job

(58) *There arrived three men (last night) without PRO saying
hello

(59) ?The news upset John while reading the paper

(60) ?There arrived three packages without exploding

(61) Sono entrati tre uomini senza identificarsi

(62) *Il est entré trois hommes sans s'annoncer

(63) There arrived two knights on each other's horses

(64) I saw two men on each other's birthdays

(65) If, as I have argued, the configuration for this high
binding is provided by overt raising to Spec of AgrO,
failure of Control by a complement is even more
mysterious.
5. Inherent Case as Structural

(66) Is inherent Case 'structural'? Stjepanović (1996) argues that it is.

(67) SC has many verbs with the lexical property of licensing Case other than accusative (hence presumably inherent) on their complements.

(68) a 'vladati' (rule) and 'ovladati' (master) license instrumental
b 'pomoći' (help) licenses dative
c 'sjetiti' (remember) licenses genitive.

(69) As in English, an accusative object (presumably structurally Case-marked) can bind into an adverbial.

(70) Slikao je Samprasa i Ivanisevića za vrijeme među jednog protiv drugog
'He photographed Sampras and Ivanisevic (Acc.) during each other's matches'

(71) Significantly, a dative object has the same binding potential:

(72) Pomogao je Samprasu i Ivaniseviću za vrijeme među jednog protiv drugog
'He helped Sampras and Ivanisevic (Dat.) during each other's matches'

(73) Similarly a dative quantifier, just like an accusative quantifier, can successfully bind a pronoun within an adverbial, thus obviating NCP:

(74) Ona kritikuje svakog bez njegovog znanja
'She criticizes everyone (Acc.) without his knowing'

(75) Ona pomogne svakom bez njegovog znanja
'She helps everyone (Dat.) without his knowing'

(76) With the possible exception of one rather unclear control example, an overwhelmingly consistent pattern has emerged: scope and binding go together, and both are 'low' except when there is overt raising.

(77) The analysis, slightly modifying Chomsky (1995a), is that covert raising affects only formal features, but that scope (Chomsky's proposal) and binding (my extension) involve more than formal features.

6. A Puzzling Divorce of Binding and Scope

(78) Yatsushiro (1996) shows that, unexpectedly, scope and binding diverge, and in just the way that Chomsky claims (evidently incorrectly) that they do in English.

(79) Yatsushiro provides strong arguments that in Japanese unaccusative constructions, the complement of the unaccusative verb remains in its underlying position in overt syntax.
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1. General Properties of Pseudogapping

(1) John will select me, and Bill will you

(2) Mary hasn't dated Bill, but she has o Harry. [Sag (1976)]

(3) This ellipsis phenomenon displays some properties of Gapping (there is a right side remnant) alongside some properties of VP-ellipsis (there is a finite auxiliary).

(4)a Mary hasn't dated Bill, but Susan has
b Mary hasn't dated Bill, but Susan, Harry

(5)a (*)Bill ate the peaches and Harry did the grapes
b (*)Bill ate the peaches and Harry will the grapes

[Jackendoff (1971)]

(6) (+) John reviewed the play and Mary did the book

[Lappin (1991)]

(7)a (?) If you don't believe me, you will o the weatherman
b (?) I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did o a magazine

[Levin (1978)]

(8)a *You probably just feel relieved, but I do o jubilant
b *Rona sounded annoyed, and Sue did o frustrated

[Levin (1978)]

2. Towards an Analysis

(9) More than just the verb can be deleted:

(10) The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty

(11) *John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

(12) If we reject an ellipsis rule affecting a discontinuous portion of the structure, we will want to consider the possibility that Pseudogapping constructions result from VP ellipsis, with the remnant having moved out of the VP by some rule.

(13) Jayaseelan (1990) presents just such an analysis, with the movement rule being Heavy NP Shift.

(14) *John gave Bi a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

(15) *John gave Bi a lot of money [the fund for the preservation of VOS languages]

(16) *John gave Bi a lot of money, and Mary will give Bill a lot of advice

(17) John gave Bill Bi yesterday [more money than he had ever seen]

(18) In the acceptable examples seen so far, the remnant is accusative: either the direct object in a simple transitive construction, or the first object in a double object construction, or an exceptionally Case marked subject of a complement. This suggests raising to Spec of Agr as the alternative to HNPS. Later, I will consider the driving force for the raising (and conclude that not just accusative NP can raise).

(19) The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty

(20) If LF copying can peer into the LF derivation (a possibility discussed by Hornstein (1984)), then potentially there is a stage where the accusative NP has raised but the V has not yet raised:

(21) [Diagram of AgrP]

(22) Jones was arrested to.,.n and Smith was arrested too

(23) You have to sign onto it [the terminal] like you do o the terminal

[Levin (1979/1986)]

(24) The best cases of objects of prepositions as remnants "...are likely those whose preposition forms a constituent with the verb rather than the following NP."

(25) The terminal must be signed onto

(26) *I signed onto yesterday the terminal in the computer lab
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(27) a. John spoke to Bill and Mary should Susan
    b. Bill was spoken to by John
(28) a. John talked about linguistics and Mary will philosophy
    b. Linguistics was talked about by John
(29) a. John swam beside Bill and Mary did Susan
    b. Bill was swum beside by John
(30) a. John stood near Bill and Mary should Susan
    b. Bill was stood near by John

(31) a. John took advantage of Bill and Mary will Susan
    b. Bill was taken advantage of by John

(32) a. John spoke to yesterday the man he met at the beach
    b. John talked about yesterday the man he met at the beach
    c. John took advantage of yesterday the man he met at the beach
    d. John swam beside yesterday the man he met at the beach
    e. John stood near yesterday the man he met at the beach

(33) A technical problem: on the theory of LF movement advocated by Chomsky (1995a), and further defended by Lasnik (1995a, b, c), the necessary structure for LF copying would not be created. On that theory, since movement is invariably triggered by the need for formal features to be checked, all else equal only formal features move. When movement is overt (triggered by a strong feature), PF requirements demand that an entire constituent move, via a sort of pied piping. However, when movement is covert, PF requirements are irrelevant so economy dictates that movement not be of the entire constituent, but just of the formal features. It is very difficult to see how covert raising of (the formal features of) the remnant NP to Spec of Agrₐ could possibly create the appropriate ellipsis licensing configuration.


(35) *Bill the peaches ate

(36) If the complement remnant raises overtly, then the V of which it is a complement must also raise overtly to a still higher position, given the word order of English. Koizumi's specific proposal, which he calls the split VP hypothesis, is that V raises to a higher 'shell' V position, as shown in (41):
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(37) Note that if the licensing configuration is created prior to the LF/PF split, then ellipsis could just as easily be a PF deletion phenomenon, the sort of analysis of ellipsis consistently advocated by Chomsky, as in Chomsky (1995a, b), or, much earlier, in a 1971 lecture cited by Wasow (1972), where, according to Wasow, Chomsky "suggests that VP deletion and Sluicing can be formulated as very late rules which delete unstressed strings."

(38) In Lasnik (1995a, c) I offer several arguments for a Koizumi-type approach (summarized in other talks in this Workshop), and I suggest that the NP raising is driven by an 'EPP' feature that resides in Agr₀. Further, following Chomsky, I assume that Agr₀ and Agr₁ are really the same category, the distinction merely mnemonic. Overt object shift and overt subject shift are then the same phenomenon: satisfaction of the EPP.

(39) ?John spoke to Bill and Mary should to Susan
(40) ?John spoke to the women during each other's presentations, and Mary will the men

(41) ?John talked about linguistics and Mary will about philosophy

(42) ?John spoke to the women during each other's presentations, and Mary will the men
(43) *John spoke to the women during each other's presentations, and Mary will to the men

(44) Mary hasn't dated Bill, but she has Harry dated
(45) *She has Harry dated
(46) Suppose that the strong feature driving V raising is a feature of the V that raises (rather than of the position it raises to). (I suggest that it is the 8-feature that will be checked against the subject.) Now suppose, following Chomsky (1993) but contra Chomsky (1995c), that an unchecked strong feature is an ill-formed PF object. Then we correctly derive the result that deletion of (a category containing) an item with an unchecked strong feature salvages the derivation. The portion of the structure that would have caused a PF crash is literally gone at that level:

(47) ...Bill did the peaches

(48) John will give Bill a lot of money

(49) ?Mary gave Susan a lot of money, and John will give Bill a lot of money

(50) ?Mary gave Bill a lot of money, and John will give a lot of advice

(51) ?Mary gave Bill a lot of money, and John will give a lot of advice

(52) If the first object begins higher than the second, relativized minimality will guarantee that the first object remains higher. The consequence of this is that there could not be a VP (or any other constituent) to delete which includes the first object but excludes the second.

(53) ?John gave a lot of money to Bill, and Mary will give a lot of advice to Bill

(54) ?John gave a lot of money to Bill, and Mary will give a lot of money to Susan
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3. A Speculation on the Marginal Character of Pseudogapping

Even the 'good' Pseudogapping examples are somewhat degraded. That might be something to be explained.

My PF deletion analysis, coupled with the Chomsky (1993) position that a strong feature not overtly checked causes a PF crash, explains why Pseudogapping is possible at all. The unchecked strong feature of the V that fails to raise is remedied by deletion of the VP containing that V.

Chomsky (1995c), though, replaced the PF crash analysis of strong features with an LF analysis, proposing that unless a strong feature "is checked before Spell-Out it will cause the derivation to crash at LF..."

Speculation: What if the proposals of Chomsky (1993) and Chomsky (1995c) are both correct? Then a strong feature that is not checked in overt syntax will cause the derivation to crash at both PF and LF. A standard EPP violation will fall under this analysis, as will a sentence in which a verb fails to raise overtly, yet survives to the level of PF.

When a constituent containing the verb is deleted (as in Pseudogapping), the PF violation is avoided, but the LF violation persists. What do we expect the status of such a violation to be?

(*) You read what
(62) *I wonder you read what

*Mary gave Susan a lot of money, and John will give Bill a lot of advice

4. Another Relativized Minimality Effect?

*Mary gave Susan a lot of advice, and John will give Bill a lot of advice

??????
The VP ellipsis site must be governed by an appropriate head. 
Zagona (1982;1988)

The licensing head is a particular sort of Infl, with tense being the crucial feature. Martin (1992;1996)

Mary left, and John did too

Mary hired Susan, and John did Bill

In both (65) and (73), two maximal projections, VP and AgrP, intervene between Past and the target VP, VP2.

There is one potentially relevant difference: in the more-or-less acceptable (73) the intervening V head is empty, while in the unacceptable (65) the intervening V is the lexical verb give, which has raised from the lowest VP. This is suggestive of relativized minimality.

Suppose the head licensing VP ellipsis does so by attracting a feature of the head of the VP. As a consequence of having 'lost' this feature, the VP would now be PF defective unless it deleted. In (65), a feature of the raised lexical V has been attracted, but that V has not been deleted, resulting in a PF crash.

In the reasonably acceptable Pseudogapping structure (73), even though hire is geometrically rather remote from the licensing Tense, there is no nearer V with a feature for Tense to attract, so, in the spirit of relativized minimality, it can attract a structurally distant feature.

5. A Brief Reconsideration of Heavy NP Shift

John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

John gave a lot of money (the fund for the preservation of VOS languages)
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(80) John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will *give* Bill a lot of advice.

(81) John gave Bill a yesterday (more money than he had ever seen).

(82) Even if, as I have argued, there is a process other than HNPS creating Pseudogapping remnants, why can’t HNPS also create them?

(83) Suppose a lot of advice in (83) undergoes HNPS to some position higher than Bill and the residual VP deletes (taking Bill with it).

(84) Note that on this derivation, the 'EPP' feature of Agr3 is not checked overtly, nor are two of the strong 6-features of give checked overtly.

(85) Starting again from (83), a lot of advice can raise to Spec of Agr3, and give can raise to VP via Agr2 and Agr3. A lot of advice undergoes HNPS to a position outside VP, perhaps adjoined to TP, VP itself, or AgrP3; and finally VP deletes.

(87) Assuming that the landing site is VP1, a closer VP, VP2 has been skipped.

(88) Similarly, if AgrP1 is the landing site, AgrP3 and AgrP2 have been skipped.

(89) A consequence of this line of reasoning: the shifted heavy NP in (81) is not very high, which entails that the adverb is also not very high. One workable position for the adverb is adjunct to the lowest VP (at least as one option). Given my analysis of Pseudogapping, an example like the following provides support for this conjecture:

John saw Bill yesterday and Mary did *Susan yesterday.

(90) Susan has raised out of the lower of two VPs, and the residual VP, evidently including yesterday, has deleted.

(92) Adverbs that, by their semantic character, would be assumed to be very high in the structure do not undergo 'small' VP deletion (i.e., Pseudogapping), or even large VP deletion:
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(94) "John saw Bill, fortunately, and Mary did probably Susan, fortunately"
(95) "John saw Bill, fortunately, and Mary did see Bill, fortunately, (too)"

(96) Correspondingly, HNPS around such high adverbs seems much less available than around lower ones:

(97) John saw yesterday his old friend from Philadelphia
(98) "John saw fortunately his old friend from Philadelphia"
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(1) Given an economy condition like Procrastinate, we would expect all movement to be covert. When movement is overt, it must have been forced to operate 'early' by some special requirement. Chomsky (1993;1994;1995) codes this requirement into 'strong features'.

(2) A strong feature that is not checked in overt syntax causes a derivation to crash at PF. Chomsky (1993)
B A strong feature that is not checked (and eliminated) in overt syntax causes a derivation to crash at LF. Chomsky (1994/1995a)
C A strong feature must be eliminated (almost) immediately upon its introduction into the phrase marker. Chomsky (1995a)

(3) Justification for (A): "the position of Spell-Out in the derivation is determined by either PF or LF properties, these being the only levels, on minimalist assumptions. Furthermore, parametric differences must be reduced to morphological properties if the Minimalist Program is framed in the terms so far assumed. ... we expect that at the LF level there will be no relevant difference between languages with phrases overtly raised or in situ (e.g., wh-phrases or verbs). Hence, we are led to seek morphological properties that are reflected at PF." Chomsky (1993, p.192)

(4) Technological details: "'strong' features are visible at PF and 'weak' features invisible at PF. These features are not legitimate objects at PF; they are not proper components of phonetic matrices. Therefore, if a strong feature remains after Spell-Out, the derivation crashes... Alternatively, weak features are deleted in the PF component so that PF rules can apply to the phonological matrix that remains; strong features are not deleted so that PF rules do not apply, causing the derivation to crash at PF." Chomsky (1993, p.198)

(5) Justification for (B) (apparently empirical rather than conceptual).

(6) 'John read what?'

(7) a) "...Spell-Out can apply anywhere, the derivation crashing if a 'wrong choice' is made...If the phonological component adds a lexical item at the root, it will introduce semantic features, and the derivation will crash at PF. If the covert component does the same, it will introduce phonological features, and the derivation will therefore crash at LF..."

b) Suppose that root C (complementizer) has a strong feature that requires overt wh-movement. We now want to say that unless this feature is checked before Spell-Out it will cause the derivation to crash at LF to avoid the possibility of accessing C after Spell-Out in the covert component." Chomsky (1994, p.60)

(8) Technology: "Slightly adjusting the account in Chomsky (1993), we now say that a checked strong feature will be stripped away by Spell-Out, but is otherwise ineliminable." Chomsky (1994, p.60)

(9) Spell-Out: C [strong Q] John read what "LF

(10) Spell-Out: John read what LF: C [strong Q] John read what "LF

(11) Justification for (C) (contra (A)): "...formulation of strength in terms of PF convergence is a restatement of the basic property, not a true explanation. In fact, there seems to be no way to improve upon the bare statement of the properties of strength. Suppose, then, that we put an end to evasion and simply define a strong feature as one that a derivation 'cannot tolerate': a derivation D-E is canceled if E contains a strong feature..." Chomsky (1995a, p.233)

(12) Technology: "A strong feature...triggers a rule that eliminates it: [strength] is associated with a pair of operations, one that introduces it into the derivation...a second that (quickly) eliminates it." Chomsky (1993a, p.233)

(13) Ellipsis provides potential evidence for (A), if it is, as suggested by Chomsky and Lasnik (1993), a PF deletion process.

(14) Two instances: first Pseudogapping then Sluicing.

(15)a If you don't believe me, you will go the weatherman
b I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did go a magazine
c Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't go meteorology Levin (1978)

(16)a The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty
b John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

(17) You might not believe me but you will Bob

(18) NP-raising to Spec of Agro ('Object Shift') is overt in English. [Koizumi (1993;1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)
Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr, followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995c)]

Suppose the strong feature driving V-raising resides in the lexical V rather than in the higher 'shell' V. The strong feature of the verb must either be checked by overt raising to the shell V or be contained in an ellipsis site. PF deletion could eliminate the unchecked strong feature.

Sluicing - WH-Movement followed by deletion of IP (abstracting away from 'split Infl' details). [Saito and Murasugi (1990), Lobeck (1990)]

Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
Speaker B: I wonder who Mary will see?

Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
Speaker B: Who Mary will see?
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(30) "Who Mary will see?
(31) Who will Mary see?

(32) Suppose that in a matrix interrogative, it is Infl that has a strong feature, rather than C. The strong feature of Infl must either be checked by overt raising to the interrogative C or be contained in an ellipsis site. PF deletion could eliminate the unchecked strong feature.

(33) Infl-raising to C is uncontroversially overt in normal matrix interrogatives. NP-raising to Spec of Agr on the other hand, is standardly assumed to be covert in English. Lasnik (1995a,b), based on Lasnik and Saito (1991) (see also Postal (1974) and Wyngaard (1989)) and den Dikken (1995), argue that such movement is, indeed, overt.

There is a man here

There are men here

Many linguistics students aren't here

There aren't many linguistics students here

Some linguists seem to each other [t to have been given good job offers]

"There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists given good job offers]

No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [t to have been formulated]

"There seem to any philosophers [t to have been some linguistic theories formulated]

Some defendant, seems to his lawyer [t to have been at the scene]

"There seems to his lawyer [t to have been some defendant, at the scene]

"The operation Move...seeks to raise just F." Chomsky (1995a)

When movement is covert, hence only of formal features, the referential and quantificational properties needed to create new binding and scope configurations are left behind, so no such new configurations are created. Lasnik (1995a,b;1997) (contra Chomsky (1995a), at least in part)

The DA questioned two men during each other's trials

The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other's trials

The DA proved [these to have been two men at the scene] during each other's trials

(40) a The DA questioned noone during any of the trials

b The DA proved [there to be noone at the scene] during any of the trials

(41) The DA questioned two suspects during his, trial

(42) a The DA proved [no suspect, to be at the scene] during his, trial

b The DA proved [there to be no suspect, at the scene of the crime] during his, trial

(43) The DA questioned noone during any of the trials

(44) a The DA proved [noone to be at the scene] during any of the trials

b The DA proved [there to be noone at the scene] during any of the trials

(45) The DA questioned no suspect during his, trial

(46) a The DA proved [no suspect, to be at the scene] during his, trial

b The DA proved [there to be no suspect, at the scene of the crime] during his, trial

(47) One further argument: Given the feature movement theory of covert movement, if an instance of movement creates a new ellipsis configuration, that movement must be overt. (This is true whether ellipsis is PF deletion or LF copying.)

(48) Possible arguments against the PF approach to strong features (2A):

(49) a 'Look-ahead' is needed. At a given point in the overt portion of a derivation, it is necessary to inspect the PF representation to see whether Procrastinate can be evaded. (The LF approach (2B) shares this problem.)

b The derivation of "John read what in (9-10) above, with covert insertion of C with a strong feature, won't be blocked.

(50) (2C) above, repeated here, is designed to eliminate the Look-ahead problem.

(51) A strong feature must be eliminated (almost) immediately upon its introduction into the phrase marker. Chomsky (1995a)

(52) "We...virtually derive the conclusion that a strong feature triggers an overt operation to eliminate it by checking. This conclusion follows with a single exception: covert merger (at the root) of a lexical item that has a strong feature but no phonological features..." Chomsky (1995a, p.233)

(53) (54) is thus still problematic.

(54) "John read what

(55) To prevent this, covert insertion of strong features must be barred. Chomsky proposes to do this with the economy principle (56):

a enters the numeration only if it has an effect on output.

(56) "Under [(56)], the reference set [for economy comparisons] is still determined by the numeration, but output conditions enter into determination of the numeration itself..." Chomsky (1995a, p.294)
Look-ahead?

"With regard to the PF level, effect can be defined in terms of literal identity... is selected only if it changes the phonetic form.

At the LF level the condition is perhaps slightly weaker, allowing a narrow and readily computable form of logical equivalence to be interpreted as identity.

Clearly, covert insertion of a C will have no phonetic effect. Will it have an effect at the LF output?

If it will, then covert insertion is allowed, and we generate (54) with structure (63):

C [: John read what]

If it will not, then we generate (54) with structure (65):

[, John read what]

(65) violates no morphological requirements, and, if C has no effect on output, then it should mean exactly what did John read?

"...the interface representations (n,A) are virtually identical whether the operation [covert insertion of strong features] takes place or not. The PF representations are in fact identical, and the LF ones differ only trivially in form, and not at all in interpretation." Chomsky (1995a, p.294)

Chomsky (1995a) proposes that strength is always a property of an 'attracting' head, never a property of the item that moves. The above analyses of Pseudogapping and Sluicing are incompatible with that proposal.

There is a possible alternative analysis, based on the Chomsky (1995a) theory of pied-piping, particularly as explicated by Ochi (1997).

"For the most part - perhaps completely - it is properties of the phonological component that require pied-piping. Isolated features and other scattered parts of words may not be subject to its rules, in which case the derivation is canceled; or the derivation might proceed to PF with elements that are 'unpronounceable,' violating FI." Chomsky (1995a, p.262)

Just how broadly considerations of PF convergence might extend is unclear, pending better understanding of morphology and the internal structure of phrases. Note that such considerations could permit raising without pied-piping even overtly, depending on morphological structure..." (Chomsky 1995a, p.264)
A Gap in an Ellipsis Paradigm: Theoretical Implications?

Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

1. A Gap in a Paradigm

(1) John slept, and Mary will too

(2a) *John slept, and Mary will sleep too
    b John slept, and Mary will sleep too

(3) ?John was sleeping, and Mary will too

(4a) *John was sleeping, and Mary will sleep too
    b John was sleeping, and Mary will sleep too

(5) John has slept, and Mary will too

(6a) *John has slept, and Mary will slept too
    b John has slept, and Mary will sleep too

(7) Hypothesis 1: Any form of a verb V can be 'deleted under identity' with any form of V.

(8) *John was here, and Mary will too [See Warner (1986)]

(9a) *John was here and Mary will was here too
    b John was here and Mary will be here too

(10) Hypothesis 2 (merely a descriptive generalization): A form of a verb V other than be or 'auxiliary' have can be 'deleted under identity' with any form of V. A form of be or auxiliary have can only be deleted under identity with the very same form.

(11) Hypothesis 3: A form of a verb V can only be deleted under identity with the very same form. Forms of be and auxiliary have (finite ones, at least) are introduced into syntactic structures already fully inflected. Forms of 'main' verbs are created out of lexically introduced bare forms and independent affixes.

(12) John [Af] sleep, and Mary will sleep too

2. Motivation for the Hybrid Morphological Account

(13) Lasnik (1995d) proposes this morphological difference between main and auxiliary verbs in English to account for the fact that finite auxiliaries show the full range of raising effects (like all verbs in French), while main verbs in English show none of them. The proposal is that the English finite auxiliaries (and all finite verbs in French) are lexically introduced with inflectional features which must be checked against a functional head (or heads). English main verbs are lexically uninflected, so they don't raise.

(14a) *John not left
    b *John left not

(15) Just as in Chomsky (1955) and Chomsky (1957), the process associating the finite affix with the bare verb ('Affix Hopping') requires adjacency.

(16) The strictly lexicalist theory of Chomsky (1993) in which all verbs (in fact all lexical items) are introduced fully inflected does not account for (14).

(17a) Strong lexicalism: verbs are pulled from the lexicon fully inflected.
    b There is no affix hopping.
    c The inflected V raises to Aggr (and T) to 'check' the features it already has. This checking can, in principle, take place anywhere in a derivation on the path to LF.
    d Once a feature of Aggr has done its checking work, it disappears.

(18a) In French, the V-features of Aggr (i.e., those that check features of a V) are strong.
    b In English, the V-features of Aggr are weak.

(19a) If V raises to Aggr overtly, the V-features of Aggr check the features of the V and disappear. If V delays raising until LF, the V-features of Aggr survive into PF.
    b V-features are not legitimate PF objects.
    c Strong features are visible at PF; weak features are not. Surviving strong features cause the derivation to 'crash' at PF.
    d This forces overt V-raising in French.

(20) In English, delaying the raising until LF does not result in an ill-formed PF object, so such a derivation is possible. What makes it necessary is:

(21) 'Procrastinate': Whenever possible, delay an operation until LF.

(22) Why do have and be raise overtly?

(23) Have and be are semantically vacuous, hence not visible to LF operations. (Chomsky does not discuss modals.) Thus, if they have not raised overtly, they will not be able to raise at all. Their unchecked features will cause the LF to crash.

(24) *John not left
3. An Alternative Treatment of the Gap?

(27) Given that finite forms of be raise, while finite forms of main verbs do not, could it be that, for some reason, a trace can't serve as (part of) an antecedent for ellipsis? This possibility was considered, and rejected, in Lasnik (1995d).

(28) a Linguistics, I like, and you should like {linguistics, too}.
b Someone will be in the office. Yes, there will be someone in the office.

c That this approach will fail is likely. No, it isn't likely that this approach will fail.

(29) "...a raised V has fewer features than a non-raised V, assuming that the features that cause raising are not copied (this has to be assumed in a minimalist framework or the raising operation would not eliminate features and so would have no motivation, and so would be impossible given the general last-resort nature of movement)." Roberts (n.d.)

4. Problems for the Alternative

(30) A candidate for a VP headed by verb trace antecedent: deletion of a VP headed by a lexical verb:

Pseudogapping as overt NP raising to Spec of Agr, followed by VP ellipsis. (Lasnik (1995c), based on the proposal of Koizumi (1993), following Johnson (1991), that 'object shift' is overt in English.)

(31) A number of languages with overt V raising to I nonetheless allow VP ellipsis, with the effect that everything in the VP except the V is deleted. Doron (1980) shows this for Hebrew:

Q: Salaxt et ha-yeladim le-beit-ha-sefer
A: Salaxti

"Did you send the kids to school?"

I sent
"I did"

(32) Q: Salaxt et ha-yeladim le-beit-ha-sefer
A: Salaxti

I sent
"I did"

(33) Martins (1994) shows the same thing for Portuguese and McGlokey (1990) does for Irish:

(34) A Martas deu um livro ao Jose? Sim, deu. the Martha gave a book to the John yes gave "Did Martha give a book to John? Yes, she did.

Q: A chuir tò isterach air
A: Chuir [PAST] put [PAST] you in on it

"Did you apply for it?"

"Yes."

(35) Q: A chuir tò isterach air
A: Chuir [PAST] put [PAST] you in on it

"Did you apply for it?"

"Yes."

(36) \([v \{v,e\} X]\) cannot antecede VP-ellipsis of \([v\{V\} X]\).
50) Speaker A: Never will [, Susan \n understand some
linguists]
Speaker B: Tell me which linguists [, Susan \n will never
understand]
51) Speaker A: Never will [, Susan \n understand some
linguists]
Speaker B: Which linguists [, Susan \n will never
understand]

5. Why Isn't Roberts' Line of Reasoning Valid?

52) Given that a raised X has had a feature (or set of
features) checked and deleted, why can it antecede the
deletion of an XP with its head in situ (as in
Pseudogapping and Sluicing)?

53) An ultimately related question: Given that NP raises but V
doesn't raise in the Pseudogapping construction, why must
V raise in corresponding non-elliptical version?

54) *Mary will Susan hire

55) A parallel question: Given that Infl doesn't raise to Comp
in the Sluicing construction, why must Infl raise in the
 corresponding matrix non-elliptical version?

56) *Which linguists Susan will never understand

57) Overt movement is driven by a 'strong feature' of a head,
which attracts a matching feature within the complement
of that head. All movement, whether covert or overt, is
fundamentally feature movement. [Chomsky (1995a)]

58) \[\text{Agr}_P \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{Mary} \]
\[\text{Agr}_S \]
\[\text{TP} \]
\[\text{T} \]
\[\text{will} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{V} \]
\[\text{[strong F]} \]
\[\text{will} \]
\[\text{Susan} \]
\[\text{Agr}_S \]
\[\text{VP} \]
\[\text{V} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{hire} \]
\[\text{[F]} \]

59) "For the most part - perhaps completely - it is properties
of the phonological component that require pied-piping.
Isolated features and other scattered parts of words may
not be subject to its rules, in which case the derivation
is canceled or the derivation might proceed to PF with
elements that are 'unpronounceable,' violating FI." 
Chomsky (1995a, p.262)

60) "Applied to the feature F, the operation Move thus creates
at least one and perhaps two "derivative chains"
alongside the chain CH(F, C) constructed by the
 operation itself. One is CH[(F F), (F, C),], consisting of
the set of formal features F[F] and its trace; the other
is CH[(C, C), (a, C),], a category carried along by generalized
pied-piping and including at least the lexical item
containing F. CH is always constructed, CH only when
required for convergence...As noted, CH should be
completely dispensable, were it not for the need to
accommodate to the sensorimotor apparatus." [p.265]

61) "Just how broadly considerations of PF convergence might
extend is unclear, pending better understanding of
morphology and the internal structure of phrases. Note
that such considerations could permit raising without
pied-piping even overtly, depending on morphological
structure..." [p.264]

62) In (58), if only the attracted features raise, but the V
does not raise, a PF crash will ensue, but only if the
offending item exists at that level. Deletion provides
another way to salvage the derivation. When the lower VP
is deleted without the V having raised, a PF crash is
avoided and the result is acceptable Pseudogapping.

63) \[\text{CP} \]
\[\text{NP} \]
\[\text{who} \]
\[\text{C} \]
\[\text{IP} \]
\[\text{[strong F]} \]
\[\text{NP}\]
\[\text{Mary} \]
\[\text{I} \]
\[\text{VP} \]
\[\text{will} \]
\[\text{I} \]
\[\text{[F]} \]
\[\text{VP} \]
\[\text{see} \]

64) An account completely parallel to that provided for (58)
is available for (63).
Note that now, the major prima facie counter-examples to Roberts’ proposal ((36), as generalized to (44)), are completely compatible with it.

So why not accept the Roberts-Potsdam account of the gap in the original ellipsis paradigm?

John slept, and Mary will too

*John was here, and Mary will too

Here be does not raise at all, with or without pied-piping, whereas was obviously does raise, resulting in features being checked and deleted.

BUT what are those features? It is hard to see how they could be anything other than inflectional features. But checking and deleting the inflectional features of was makes it more like be, not less like be.

VI. Another Kind of Justification for (44)

[Under ellipsis:] Corresponding X\textsuperscript{\textcircled{X}} traces [unlike XP traces] must have the same binder in both the antecedent and target clauses.

Chicken, she’ll eat, but ostrich, she won’t

Potsdam claims that in Hebrew and Irish, both V-raising languages that have VP ellipsis, “the raised verbs in ellipsis antecedent and target clauses must be the same.” He suggests that (72) is universal.

Q: Does Dina knit the sweaters that she wears?
A: No her mother buys the sweaters that she wears

The putative answer (79)A is strikingly unresponsive to the question.

Dina knits the sweaters that she wears
while mother her buys

Dina loves every sweater that she wears
but mother her hates

cel ve he loveSet
Dina loves every sweater that she wears
but mother her hates

Dina loves every sweater that she wears but her mother, hates every sweater that she wears."

Does Dina knit the sweaters that she wears?

A: No her mother buys the sweaters that she wears

The putative answer (79)A is strikingly unresponsive to the question.

Dina knits the sweaters that she wears
while mother her buys

Dina loves every sweater that she wears
but mother her hates

Dina loves every sweater that she wears but her mother, hates every sweater that she wears."

Hebrew Doren (1990)

Al is 'strict' or 'sloppy'. A2 is only strict.

Ivan piše rad pažljivo, a njegov asistent Zita
Ivan writes paper carefully and his assistant reads
"Ivan is writing a paper carefully, and his assistant is reading it carefully."

Serbo-Croatian

Marko gradi sebi kucu, a Marija kupuje
Marko builds himself a house and Marija buys
"Marko is building himself a house, and Maria is buying herself a house."
Some Reconstruction Riddles

Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

1. Condition C Complement/Adjunct Reconstruction Asymmetries
(The 'Lebeaux Effect')

(1) a Which report that John revised did he submit?
   b Which report that John was incompetent did he submit?
   - Freidin (1986)
(2) a *Which report that John was nice did he submit?
   b *Which report that John wrote did he like?
   - Lebeaux (1988)
(3) a *Which claim that John was asleep did he later deny
   b *Which claim that John made did he later deny
   - Munn (1994)
(4) a Which claim [that John was asleep] was he willing to discuss
   b Which claim [that John made] was he willing to discuss
   - Chomsky (1993)
(5) a The claim that John was asleep, he was willing to discuss
   b The claim that John made, he was willing to discuss
   - Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)
(6) The claim that John was asleep seems to him, [IP t to be correct]
   Chomsky (1993)
(7) "I seem to him, [IP t to like John]
(8) The 'Extension Condition': structure must be built strictly cyclically.
   a Adjuncts are exempt from the Extension Condition; relative clauses are adjuncts.
   b "Reconstruction" is essentially a reflex of the formation of operator-variable constructions.
   c An operator chain (a sequence of copies) undergoes complementary deletion.
   d Condition C is an LF requirement.
   Chomsky (1993)
(10) a [Which claim [that John made]] was he willing to discuss
   b [Which claim [that John made]] was he willing to discuss
   c For which x that John made, he was willing to discuss x claim
   Interpretation (?)
(24) a. The claim that the director was corrupt, he was unwilling to discuss
   b. That the director was corrupt, everyone knew that he would always be able to deny with a straight face

Postal (1997)

(25) a. Whose allegation that John was less than truthful did he refute vehemently?
   b. Whose claim that the Senator had violated the campaign finance regulations did he dismiss as politically motivated?

Kuno (1997)

(26) a. Which claim that John was asleep did he later deny
   b. Which claim that John made did he later deny

Munn (1994)

(27) Later than what, one might ask?

(28) a. Whose claim that John is nice did he believe?
   b. Whose claim that John is nice did he motivate?

Lebeaux (1988)

(29) Susan: John is nice.
Mary: John is nice.
John: I believe Susan but I don't believe Mary.

(30) Which ['pro'] report that John was incompetent did he submit?

Freidin (1986)

(31) What if the complement/relative asymmetry with WH-movement is illusory. How problematic is that for the theory?

(32) a. (9) a vs. b is arguably just a stipulation, as is (9)c.
   b. (15) is clearly a stipulation.
   c. If anything, then lack of that asymmetry would be a 'better' state of affairs. (The only mildly negative consequence, depending on your point of view, is that a potential argument for traces, i.e., copies, disappears.)

(33) The Projection Principle requires that heads and their arguments, and the arguments of these heads, and so on, must be present in the base.
   a. Adjuncts need not be present in the base.
   b. Condition C is not earmarked for any particular level—it applies throughout the derivation, and marks as ungrammatical any configuration it sees, in which a name is c-commanded by a c-indexed pronoun.

(34) a. The claim that John was asleep seems to him, (i.e., t to be correct)
   b. It was proven that no large Mersenne number was proven to be prime

Lebeaux (1988); Lebeaux (1990)

(35) a. Some politician is likely to address John's constituency
   b. Someone is likely to clean the blackboard

Lebeaux (1988); Lebeaux (1990)

3. Quantifier Lowering?

(43) [(43)] may be taken as asserting either (i) that there is a politician, e.g., Rockefeller, who is likely to address John's constituency, or (ii) that it is likely that there is some politician (or other) who will address John's constituency.

(44) On the first reading, the speaker has a particular individual in mind (a politician, in this instance), but, for some discourse reason or other, does not identify that individual. On the second reading (the 'lowered' one), the speaker does not have any particular individual in mind. The ambiguity might then fall under theme-rheme properties, the 'wide scope' quantifier being a theme or topic.

(45) Some politician addressed John's constituency
   a. ...namely Rockefeller
   b. ...I can tell by all the balloons and flags on the green

(46) Someone is likely to clean the blackboard
   a. ...namely, Joe the maintenance man
   b. I have no idea who, but the board was covered with phrase structure trees last night, and is now bare

(47) Someone cleaned the blackboard
   a. ...namely Joe the maintenance man
   b. No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime

(48) It was proven that no large Mersenne number is prime
We refer to this material for more detail.
Chains of Arguments

Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

(1) "That reconstruction should be barred in A-chains is ... plausible on conceptual grounds." Chomsky (1995a, p.326)

(2) Chomsky's concern at this point is trace deletion. He suggests that certain analyses of Chomsky (1991) and Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) based on intermediate trace deletion are incorrect, and that there is, in fact, no process of trace deletion.

(3) The effects of trace deletion follow from reconstruction "understood in minimalist terms".

(4) "Who do you wonder [c, whether [n John said [c:] l'

(5) Deletion is possible only to turn an illegitimate LF object into a legitimate one, where the legitimate LF objects are:
(a) Uniform chains (all of whose members are in A-positions, A'-positions, or x0-positions)
(b) Operator-variable pairs.

(6) Deletion in the chain (Who, t', t) is permissible since the chain is neither uniform (Who and t' are in A'-positions, t in an A-position) nor is it an operator-variable pair.

(7) More generally, in the case of successive-cyclic A'-movement of an argument, an intermediate trace (starred or otherwise) can (in fact must) be deleted in LF, voiding an ECP violation when the trace to be deleted is starred.

(8) On the other hand, long movement as in (10) will be an ECP violation, since the movement chain in this instance is uniformly A', so economy prevents the deletion of t':

(10) "How do you wonder [c, whether [n John said [c:] l' solved the problem]]]" (−y)

(9) Similarly, ultra-long A-movement will also be properly excluded, even when the first step is 'short', as in

(12) "John seems [that [it is likely [t' to be arrested]]]

(13) "John seems [that [t' (it was told [t' that ... )]]

(14) The chain of John in (13) is non-uniform so the deletion process should be applicable, incorrectly it appears.

(15) Chomsky (1995a, p.326) concludes, "We do not want to permit the intermediate (offending) trace t to delete, unlike what happens in (long wh-movement of an argument). The distinction suggests a different approach to intermediate trace deletion: perhaps it is a reflex of the process of reconstruction, understood in minimalist terms . . . The basic assumption here is that there is no process of reconstruction; rather, the phenomenon is a consequence of the formation of operator-variable construction driven by F ull Interpretation, a process that may (or sometimes must) leave part of the trace — a copy of the moved element — intact at LF, deleting only its operator part."

(16) In fact, it does seem that the only successful uses of economy-constrained deletion in chains involve long wh-movement of arguments, where a non-uniform chain is turned into an operator-variable pair.

(17) The new approach correctly predicts that there are no instances where an ECP violation is voided by deletion of an offending intermediate trace turning a non-uniform chain into a uniform chain.

(18) BUT it is not clear that t in (13) is an offending trace in the relevant sense (i.e., in the sense of the earlier theory).

(19) Is movement from that intermediate position to the surface position of John too far?

(20) Even if it is, that could presumably be remedied by further adjunction steps.

(21) A conceivable way to retain the essence of the new analysis:

(22) a Accept the new assumption that there is no trace deletion.
b But retain from the earlier approach the idea that only operator-variable pairs and uniform chains are legitimate LF objects.

(23) Then (13), repeated as (24), would be correctly excluded, but not because of an offending trace per se. The whole chain would be an offending one.

(24) "John seems [that [t' (it was told [t' that ... )]]]

(25) The account of (12), repeated as (26), remains unchanged.

(26) "John seems [that [it is likely [t' to be arrested]]]

(27) Though the chain is legitimate, it contains an offending trace, one that now could not be eliminated under any circumstances, since (26) doesn't involve an operator chain.
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(28) The major phenomenon originally motivating the uniform chain approach now loses its account. The offending intermediate trace in the case of argument movement (4) was deletable by virtue of being part of a non-uniform chain, while the corresponding offending trace in the case of adjunct movement (10), as part of a uniform chain, was not deletable.

(29) But in the new approach, deletability has nothing to do with uniformity. Rather, the intermediate trace in (4) deletes as a direct consequence of operator-variable formation. Similarly, the intermediate trace in (10) should be able to delete.

(30) Chomsky's alternative 'functional' explanation of adjunct-argument asymmetry: Extraction of adjuncts out of islands creates 'garden paths', because there are numerous structural positions from which an adjunct could have fronted.

(31) "Ni xiangxin Lisi weisheme lai de shuofa? "You believe [the claim [that (Lisi came why)]?"

(32) "John wa Mary ga naze sore o katta kadooka siritagatte iru no? "John wants to know [whether (Mary bought it why)]?"

(33) a Why do you think John said Mary went home?
   b How do you think John said Mary solved the problem?

(34) a All trace deletion is just a consequence of the process of operator-variable creation.
   b Traces in other types of constructions are then never eliminated.

(35) That they are not eliminated in A-constructions provided part of Chomsky's account of the extreme ungrammaticality of 'improper' movement, as in (24).

(36) Almost paradoxically, Chomsky concludes that the impossibility of eliminating an A-trace makes it plausible that reconstruction should be barred in A-chains.

(37) "John expected [him to seem to me [to be intelligent]]"

(38) "Under the relevant interpretation, [(37)] can only be understood as a Condition B violation, though under reconstruction the violation should be ovated, with him interpreted in the position of ..." [p. 326]

(39) John expected [to seem to me [him to be intelligent]]

(40) a B is a governing category for a if and only if B is the minimal category containing a, a governor of a, and a SUBJECT accessible to a.
   b SUBJECT = AGR in a finite clause; NP of S in an infinitival; NP of NP in an NP.
   c \( \gamma \) is accessible to \( \alpha \) iff \( \alpha \) is in the c-command domain of \( \gamma \) and ... Chomsky (1981)

(41) \( \alpha \) in (39) is not the GC for him, since there is no SUBJECT accessible to him in that domain.

(42) Further, by hypothesis, there is no SUBJECT at all in the intermediate clause, after reconstruction.

(43) Thus, the GC for him would actually be the matrix, and the required Condition B effect is obtained after all.

(44) The GC for \( \alpha \) is the minimal functional complex (CFC) that contains \( \alpha \) and in which \( \alpha \)'s binding condition could, in principle, be satisfied. Chomsky and Lasnik (1993), based on Chomsky (1985a)

(45) The requirement on him, that it be A-free in a local domain, could, in principle, be satisfied in \( \alpha \) in (39). And since him is, in fact, A-free in that domain (which is a CFC), Condition B is satisfied (incorrectly so), as Chomsky implies.

(46) "John believes him to be intelligent"

(47) If him, the 'ECM' subject is in the lower clause, then, by the above line of reasoning, (46) is incorrectly not a Condition B violation. This can be taken as (additional) evidence that him raises into the higher clause.

(48) "Himself seems to him to be clever"

(49) Prior to movement, Condition A is presumably satisfied, since, as (50), from Chomsky (1995a), shows, the (NP in the) to phrase c-commands into the complement infinitival (though for reasons that are not immediately clear).

(50) "They seem to him [to like John,]

(51) For Belletti and Rizzi (1988), (48) is in accord with Condition A, but it violates Condition B, which, according to Belletti and Rizzi, must be satisfied specifically at S-structure (unlike Condition A, which can be satisfied anywhere in the course of the derivation).

(52) a Chomsky's (37) could also be ruled out in the same way, if its S-structure configuration is in violation of Condition B.
   b But not in a theory with no S-structure.
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(53)a (it seems that) everyone isn't there yet
b I expected [everyone not to be there yet]
c everyone seems [I not to be there yet]

"Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(53)a], and it
seems in [(53)b] but not in [(53)c]... reconstruction
in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears."
Chomsky (1995a, p.327)

(55)a Everyone didn't leave
b Everyone seems not to have left Hornstein (1995, p.237)

(56)a John would prefer for everyone not to leave (*Neg>V)
b John wanted very much for everyone not to leave (*Neg>V)
Hornstein (1995, p.239)

School policy requires that everyone not get an A
(58) It is important for everyone not to get an A

The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene of the
crime] during each other's trials
(60) The DA proved [no suspect to have been at the scene of the
crime] during his trial
(61) The DA proved [noone to have been at the scene] during any of
the trials
(62) *The DA proved [that two men were at the scene of the
crime] during each other's trials
(63) *The DA proved [that no suspect was at the scene of the
crime] during his trial
(64) *The DA proved [that noone was guilty] during any of the
trials
(65) There is a man here
(66)a There is/•are a man here
b There are/•is men here
(67) There aren't many linguistics students here
(68)a The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene of the
crime] during each other's trials
b *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene of the
crime] during each other's trials
(69)a The DA proved [no suspect to have been at the scene of the
crime] during his trial
b *The DA proved [there to have been no suspect at the
scene of the crime] during his trial
(70)a The DA proved [noone to have been at the scene] during
any of the trials
b *The DA proved [there to have been noone at the scene] during any of the trials

(71)a Some applicants, seem to each other, to be eligible for the job
b *There seem to each other to be some applicants eligible for the job
den Dikken (1995)

(72) There seem/*seem to be a man here
(73) There seem/*seems to be men here

(74) The high behavior of the ECM subject in (68)a-(70)a is the
result of overt raising.
(75) Mary hired John, and Susan will hire Bill

(76) The DA proved Jones (to be) guilty and the Assistant DA
will prove Smith (*to be) guilty
(77) The mathematician made every even number out not to be the
sum of two primes
(78) The only reading is the implausible one where the
mathematician was engaged in the futile activity of
trying to convince someone that no even number is the sum
of two primes (and not the far more plausible one where
she is merely trying to convince someone that Goldbach's
conjecture is false).
(79) everyone seems [I not to be there yet]
(80) With undeniable overt raising, the scope reconstruction at
issue is unavailable.
(81) I believe everyone not to have arrived yet
(82) I proved every Mersenne number not to be prime
(83) Everyone is believed not to have arrived yet
(84) Every Mersenne number was proved not to be prime
(85) In (84), there is strong bias towards narrow scope, but it is
still not available. Only the wildly false wide scope
reading exists.
(86) How can we reconcile the substantial evidence that ECM
subjects undergo overt raising with the scope fact in
(81)-(82)?
(87)a When it is completely clear from the word order that
raising has taken place, narrow scope for a universal ECM
subject is impossible.
b But when the word order is equivocal, narrow scope is
possible.
(88) Could it be that in the latter circumstance, overt raising
has not taken place?
(89) Mary proved every Mersenne number not to be prime, and John will every Fibonacci number.

(90) The fact that every Fibonacci number is a pseudogapping remnant indicates that it has overtly raised. If, simultaneously, it could take scope under the (elided) negation as it can in (91), we would have a contradiction.

(91) John proved every Fibonacci number not to be prime.

(92) However, it seems that unlike the situation in (91), narrow scope is not possible for every Fibonacci number in (89).

(93) (The ECM subject in the first conjunct in (89), every Mersenne number, also cannot take narrow scope under the negation in its clause. I assume this is a parallelism effect of the sort investigated by Lasnik (1972) and, more recently and more interestingly, by Fox (1995).)

(94) We are seemingly led to the conclusion that raising must be optional (a familiar kind of conclusion in GB analyses, but not in Minimalist ones).

(95) All of the binding and ellipsis phenomena above just indicate that raising is possible, available when necessary but not necessarily obligatory.

(96) BUT

(97) a. Joan believes him to be a genius even more fervently than Bob, does
   b. Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob, does

(98) It is actually not so uncommon for 'object shift' to be obligatory with pronouns even when it is optional with lexical NPs.

(99) a. Mary made John out to be a fool
   b. Mary made out John to be a fool

(100) a. Mary made him out to be a fool
   b. Mary made out him to be a fool

(101) The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum of two primes.

(102) The mathematician made out every even number not to be the sum of two primes.

(103) a. The lawyer made no witnesses out to be idiots during any of the trials
   b. The lawyer made out no witnesses to be idiots during any of the trials

(104) a. The DA made the defendants out to be guilty during each other's trials
   b. The DA made out the defendants to be guilty during each other's trials

(105) a. The DA made no suspect out to have been at the scene of the crime during his trial
   b. The DA made out no suspect to have been at the scene of the crime during his trial

(106) 'Raising to object' parallels 'raising to subject' and provides further evidence for Chomsky's claim that "...reconstruction in [an] A-chain does not take place..."

(107) How is the optionality of 'raising to object' to be instantiated?

(108) She will prove Bob to be guilty

(109) Agr_p

(110) Agr_p

(111) Agr_p
Chains of Arguments

(110) The driving force for the overt movement of the NP is a strong 'EPP' feature in Agr_0 (which I take to be the same item as Agr_5). Lasnik (1995c).

(111) One way to make the raising optional might be to abandon the idea that Agr_0 is the same item as Agr_5, assuming, instead, that only the latter obligatorily has an EPP feature. Agr_0 would only optionally have the feature.

(112) Chomsky (1995a, p.350) hints at an alternative possibility: "If Agr has no strong feature, then PF considerations, at least, give no reason for it to be present at all, and LF considerations do not seem relevant... Agr exists only when it has strong features."

(113) Along these lines, suppose, then, that the optionality of raising is the optionality of Agr_0.

(114) a) If Agr_0 is present, overt raising will be forced by its strong EPP feature.
   b) If Agr_0 is absent, there will be no overt raising; the nominal's Case will be checked by covert raising of its formal features to the V.

(115) a) Under circumstance (114)b, the nominal will not participate in high binding, nor will it survive as a Pseudogapping remnant.
   b) On the other hand, it will be able to take low scope, as in the instances of ambiguous interaction between universal and negation discussed earlier.

(116) Some politician is likely to address John's constituency.

(117) "[116] may be taken as asserting either (i) that there is a politician, e.g., Rockefeller, who is likely to address John's constituency, or (ii) that it is likely that there is some politician (or other) who will address John's constituency." May (1977).

(118) Chomsky distinguishes this phenomenon from the one found in absence of low scope under negation for a universal quantifier subject.

(119) everyone seems [not to be there yet]

(120) "[The effect of QL] could result from adjunction of the matrix quantifier to the lower IP (commanding the trace of raising and yielding a well-formed structure if the trace of quantifier lowering is deleted, along the lines of May's original proposal). But reconstruction in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears." Chomsky (1995, p.327)

(121) Under the null hypothesis that QL is precisely an A-movement reconstruction effect, some other way of resolving the apparent contradiction must be found.

(122) In this connection, it must first be noted that it is not entirely clear precisely what the phenomenon of QL is. It is often taken as paraphrasability by a sentence with expletive subject, as perhaps intended in the May (1977) quotation in (117) above. Thus, the QL version of (123) is taken to be synonymous with (124).

(123) Some politician is likely to address John's constituency.

(124) It is likely that some politician will address John's constituency.

(125) How general is the phenomenon?

(126) No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime.

(127) No one is certain to solve the problem.

(128) It was proven that no large Mersenne number is prime.

(129) It is certain that no one will solve the problem.

(130) Suppose there are five fair coins, flipped in a fair way:

(131) a) Every coin is 3% likely to land heads.
   b) It is 3% likely that every coin will land heads.

(132) a) At least on the paraphrase characterization, then, there is reason to believe that Zubizarreta and Hornstein are correct in taking absence of low reading in an example like (134) to potentially argue for failure of Quantifier Lowering, and that Chomsky is correct that that absence is indicative of impossibility of reconstruction with A-movement.

(133) everyone seems [not to be there yet]

(134) Could it be that there is no QL (and because there is no A-movement reconstruction)?

(135) Interestingly, Postal (1974) claims exactly that a quantifier that has undergone subject raising to subject position invariably takes high scope, that is, that there is no QL.

(136) Postal also suggests that the same is true for subject raising to object position, i.e., ECM constructions, but that seems much less clear.

(137) First, there are the universal-negative interactions discussed above.

(138) Second, quantificational subjects do seem to allow scope beneath ECM verbs, as in (140), which, in contrast to (141), has a pragmatically sensible reading.

(139) The defense attorney proved none of the defendants to be guilty.

(140) None of the defendants were proved to be guilty by the defense attorney.

(141) Second, quantificational subjects do seem to allow scope beneath ECM verbs, as in (140), which, in contrast to (141), has a pragmatically sensible reading.

(142) May's (1985) widely cited argument that actual syntactic lowering must be involved in the second reading of examples like (116), repeated here.
Chains of Arguments

(143) Some politician is likely to address John's constituency
(144) Such a 'lowered' reading for the quantifier is
incompatible with the binding of a pronoun in the upper
clause.
(145) No agent was believed by his superior to be a spy for
the other side.
(146) No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime.
(147) No one is certain to solve the problem.
(148) Some professor is believed by his students to be a tyrant.
(149) "It is believed by his students that some professor is a
tyrant.
(150) If, indeed, there is no A-movement reconstruction, why
should that be?
(151) Recall that for Chomsky, there is simply the stipulation
that reconstruction is a property solely of operator-
variable constructions. Further, the mechanism for
instantiating the property - no deletion of traces in A-
chains - does not seem to capture it at all.
(152) Possible alternative: A-movement, unlike A-movement,
does not leave a trace, where a trace is, following Chomsky, a
copy of the item that moves. and LF reconstruction
effects result from failure to delete (a portion of) a
lower copy.
(153) A-movement typically creates an operator-variable
relation, so at least an 'initial' trace is necessary.
(154) For A-movement, on the other hand, the trace is seemingly
a theoretical excrescence. There are not two separate
interpretive roles for a moved NP and its trace to
fulfill.
(155) Mary was elected and John was elected too.
(156) Mary was elected and John was elected too.
(157) "In the phonological component, traces delete. We have
found no reason to extend that convention to the N-Λ
computation, and indeed cannot: were we to do so, θ-
positions would be invisible at LF..." Chomsky (1995,
p.301)
(158) Suppose that instead of being determined specifically at
the LF level, θ-roles are 'checked' in the course of a
derivation.
(159) The absence of scope reconstruction would then follow from
the fact that, plausibly, determination of scope is not
satisfaction of a formal feature, but rather, is a matter
of interpretation at the interface.

(160) "...there should be no interaction between θ-theory and
the theory of movement." Chomsky (1995a, p.312)
(161) In particular, according to Chomsky, movement can never
create a θ-configuration.
(162) In a theory with D-structure, this is virtually automatic.
But within a minimalist approach where LF is assumed to
be the sole interface with semantics, the consequence
that "θ-relatedness is a 'base property'..." would be
considerably more surprising and interesting.
(163) "A θ-role is assigned in a certain structural
configuration..."
(164) If α raises to a θ-position Ty, forming the chain
CH=(α,α), the argument that must bear a θ-role is CH, not
α. But CH is not in any configuration, and α is not an
argument that can receive a θ-role. (p.313)
(165) Apparent unintended consequence: A-movement of an argument
should never be permitted (assuming that θ-role
assignment is at LF).
(166) Alternatively, θ-roles are assigned prior to movement.
(167) But then whether A-movement leaves a trace or not is
irrelevant to θ-assignment.
(168) In passing, I note that ironically, this conclusion
undermines the argument against movement into a θ-
position. If an A-trace is not only not helpful in the
assignment of a θ-role, but would actually make such
assignment impossible, then, obviously, the argument that
such a trace must exist for θ-theoretic reasons fails.
But if A-traces don't exist, then an argument will
invariably be a single-membered chain no matter how many
times it moves. Thus, even if it were to move into a θ-
position, it would still be in a 'configuration' in the
relevant sense, so the θ-role should be assignable.
(169) How can movement without a trace possibly be reconciled
with a 'bare phrase structure' theory of structure
building. A-movement not leaving a trace means that a
'term' in the sense of Chomsky (1995a) is eliminated.
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