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(1) They're trying to make John out to be a liar
(2) (?)They're trying to make out John to be a liar
Kayne (1985)

(3) ... make [[John to be a liar] out]

(4) *They're trying to make John to be a liar out

(5) "As a function of the two small clause boundaries, John is not governed by make, so that there is a Case filter violation." [p.109]

(6) ... make [[John [e]i out] [to be a liar],

(7) Why doesn't John in (6) violate the Case filter?

(8) "In [a ... Y ... i, O can count as a barrier to government for Y only if ... ... contains lexical material."

(9) ... make [ [e]i out] [John to be a liar],

(10) If [John to be a liar] is adjoined to the small clause headed by out, then John is separated from make by two small clauses, and in both, ... ... contains lexical material, so John violates the Case filter.

(11) If [John to be a liar] is adjoined to V, then make does not c-command John, so again John violates the Case filter.

(12) So to generate (2), it must be that [to be a liar] has further extraposed, leaving the SC of which John is the subject permeable to government:

(13) ... make [ [e]i out] [John [e]j to be a liar],

(14) (*)They're trying to make there out to be no solution to this problem

(15) They're trying to make John out to be a liar

(16) ... make [[NP, [e]i] out [to VP],]

(17) What kind of thing is [NP, e]? It can't be NP-trace, because it is not c-commanded by NP. So it must be PRO. This allows NP, to be John, as in (15), but not there, as in (14), since there can't control PRO:

(18) *There were reptiles before being mammals  [p.115]

(19) *How likely to be a riot is there  Kroch and Joshi

(20) [how likely t, to be a riot], is there, t,

(21) How likely to win is John

(22) [how likely t, to win], is John, t,

(23) [how likely PRO, to win], is John, t,

(24) I made there out to be a unicorn in the garden  Johnson (1991)

(25) (?)They made there out to be a solution to this problem

(26) What did you make John out to have said

(27) How did the DA make John out to have committed the crime

(28) ??What did you make the claim yesterday that John said

(29) *How did you make the claim yesterday that John solved the problem

(30) ??What did you claim yesterday that John said

(31) *How did you claim yesterday that John solved the problem

(32) AgrsP

|     / \   |
| NP    Agrs' |
|       I   |
| Agrs TP |
|     / \   |
| T VP   |
| past / \   |
| NP V'   |
| t_i / \   |
| V AgrsP |
| make / \   |
| NP Agrs' |
| there / \ |
| Agrs VP |
| t_moke  |
|  |
| V'     |
| / \    |
| V AgrsP |
| t_prove out / \|
| NP to be a solution |
| t_there |
I've believed there for a long time now to be no solution to the problem

I've believed John for a long time now to be a liar

...believed [NP, [e],] for a long time [[e], [to VP],]

What have you believed John for a long time now to have said

*How have you believed John for a long time now to have solved the problem

...believed NP, t, for a long time [[e], [to VP]],

Plausibly, very much as Kayne suggested, [NP, e] cannot be NP-trace, since not c-commanded by its antecedent. It can be PRO, but not if its antecedent is there.

An alternative statement of the distinction:

A-movement doesn't leave a trace Lasnik (In press), so there is no difficulty in generating (34).

There has no agreement features, so the Agr it is specifier of must attract the phi-features of the 'associate'. But in (33), by hypothesis that associate, as part of the extraposed constituent, is outside the c-command domain of the relevant Agr.

The same line of analysis carries over to the contrast between (21) and (19), repeated here:

*How likely to win is John

*How likely to be a riot is there

They're trying to make John out to be a liar

*They're trying to make out him to be a liar

On the present account, this is an 'object shift' alternation.

English, then, (a) has overt object shift; and (b) it is optional.

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

The DA proved [no men to have been at the scene] during any of the trials

*The DA proved [that no one was guilty] during any of the trials

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

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

The DA proved [there to have been no one at the scene] during any of the trials Lasnik and Saito (1991)

BUT

*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 Postal (1974)

They're trying to make him out to be a liar

*I called up John

*I called up him

*I called friends of John up

*Who did you call friends of up

I believe everyone not to be there yet

If object shift were obligatory, (73) would not allow wide scope for negation over everyone, contrary to fact.

The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum of two primes (*Neg>v)

The mathematician made out every even number not to be the sum of two primes (?Neg>v)

Strikingly, the only reading for (75) 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).

(78)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

(79)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

(80)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

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

(82) The driving force for the overt movement of the NP is a strong 'EPP' feature in Agr$_O$ (which I take to be the same item as Agr$_S_5$). Lasnik (1995c)

(83) Chomsky (1995, 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."

(84) Along these lines, suppose, then, that the optionality of raising is the optionality of Agr$_O$.

(85)a If Agr$_O$ is present, overt raising will be forced by its strong EPP feature.
b If Agr$_O$ 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. Scopal and referential features will remain below, as in (56)-(58).

(86)a Under circumstance (85)b, the nominal will not participate in high binding.
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.

(87) The search committee declared every candidate not to be qualified after the interviews (?Neg)$\triangleright$$\forall$
(88) The search committee declared every candidate not to be qualified after his interview (*Neg)$\triangleright$$\forall$

(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 Lasnik (1995). As now expected, every Fibonacci number cannot take scope under negation in (89).

(91) *I've believed for a long time now John to be a liar
(92) Parallel to the situation in (33), repeated here, feature movement (this time from John to believe will fail (plausibly for lack of c-command)
(93) *I've believed there for a long time now to be no solution to the problem
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