I. What About S-Structure?

(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) Every book that John read, he liked.
(5) Chomsky (1981): S-structure is crucial to at least one of the binding conditions, Condition C.
(6) Barss (1986) draws the same conclusion for Condition A, based on examples like the following:
(7) John wonders which picture of himself Mary showed to Susan.
(8) *John wonders who showed which picture of himself to Susan.
(9) "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)]
(10) Under the minimalist assumption that there is no level of S-structure, the LF operations QR and wh-movement don't exist or they apply in such a way that binding possibilities don't change.
(11a) There is/*are a man here.
(11b) There are/*is men here.
(12) A man is here [covert movement (Chomsky (1986)].
(13) There arrived two knights on each other's horses.
(14) Two knights arrived on each other's horses.
(15a) *There seem to each other [λ to have been some linguists given good job offers]
(15b) Some linguists seem to each other [λ to have been given good job offers].
(16a) There aren't many linguistics students here.
(16b) Many linguistics students aren't here.

(17) 'Expletive replacement' does not affect anaphoric possibility or even scope. Again, S-structure seems to be relevant. (Later, we will see how this insight is to be captured if there is no S-structure.)
(18) But what of Uriagereka's example?
(19) I saw two men on each other's birthdays.
(20) Either object position is already high enough to bind into an adverbial (as in Larson (1988)), or object overtly raises to a higher position (as proposed by Koizumi (1993;1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)):

(21a) The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials.
(21b) *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials.
(22a) 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.
(23) Even on the Larsonian phrase structure, the subject of an embedded clause is not base-generated higher than an adverbial modifying the matrix clause. Could the ECM subject raise into object position (the standard view in the 1960's, and extensively argued for by Postal (1974))?
(24) "If we succeed in eliminating recourse to c-selection as well as phrase structure rules, thus reducing syntactic representations at D-structure to projections of semantic properties of lexical items, it will follow that the complement of any lexical head in a syntactic representation must be s-selected by it, because there is no other way for the position to exist. For example, there cannot be such sentences as (68), where V is a verb that does not s-select an object and there is a pleonastic element...lacking any semantic role...John [VP V there] (68)

...Similarly, we cannot have "raising to object" to yield (70i) with the trace of Bill from the D-structure (70i):
(70i) i John [VP believes e ([Bill to be intelligent])] (70)
(70ii) if John [VP believes Bill to be intelligent].
The verb believe s-selects only a proposition. Therefore, in (70i) the position occupied by e cannot
exist at D-structure, because it is not s-selected by believe." [Chomsky (1986, pp. 90-91)]

(25) (24) is one version of Chomsky's consistent rejection of movement into 0-positions. If this is a genuine problem (see below), Koizumi's approach seems to avoid the problem.

(26)
```
VP          / \  
NP  \   \  
  V   AGR_P  / \ 
   /   \   \ 
NP  AGR_P  / V AGR_P
```

(27) 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

(28) a The DA proved [no one to have been at the scene of the crime] during any of the trials
b *The DA proved [there to have been no one at the scene of the crime] during any of the trials

(29) ?*The DA proved [that two men were at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials
(30) ?*The DA proved [that no suspect, was at the scene of the crime] during his, trial
(31) ?*The DA proved [that there was no one at the scene of the crime] during any of the trials

(32) The DA questioned no suspect, during his trial
(33) The DA questioned no one during any of the trials

(34) They're trying to make out that John is a liar
(35) They're trying to make John out to be a liar Kayne (1985), Johnson (1991)

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

(37) 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

(38) You might not believe me but you will Bob
(39) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of AgrO followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]

(40)
```
AgrP          / \  
NP  \   \  
  you / V AgrO  / \ 
   /   \   \ 
AgrO  VP  / V AgrO
```

(41)
```
AgrP          / \  
NP  \   \  
  Smith / V AgrO  / \ 
   /   \   \ 
AgrO  VP  / V S.C. 
```

(42) ?There arrived an instructor but there didn't arrive a professor
(43) I will return to the question of why the raising of V, apparently normally obligatory, need not take place in the Pseudogapping construction.
(44) *You will Bob believe
(45) *The Assistant DA will Smith prove guilty
(46) So what is going on in existential constructions? Why does the associate behave as if it is low (for scope and anaphora), even though the agreement properties indicate that movement has taken place?
Chomsky (1991) proposed that instead of (covertly) substituting for there, the associate adjoins to there. Then at least the LF's of (16)a,b repeated here are not identical.

(48)a There aren't many linguistics students here
b Many linguistics students aren't here
(49) [There [many linguistics students]] aren't there

Pictures of many students aren’t here

BUT, in (50) there is no scope relation between many and negation, while in (48)a many is inside the scope of negation.

Further, on the May (1985) theory of adjunction, assumed by Chomsky ever since, when $\alpha$ adjoins to $\beta$, $\beta$ becomes a segmented category, and $\alpha$ c-commands anything $\beta$ did prior to the adjunction.

"The operation Move, we now assume, seeks to raise just F." Chomsky (1995, p. 262)
"...only PF convergence forces anything beyond features to raise." Chomsky (1995, p. 265)

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 (1995b,c) (extending the proposal of Chomsky (1995)).

II. Subject-Object (As)symmetry

With the establishment of overt object shift in English, we are on the verge of eliminating the subject-object asymmetry codified in the Extended Projection Principle (EPP).

It is now natural to assume that the EPP requirement driving raising to 'subject position' resides in Agr, hence is also responsible for raising to 'object position', under the assumption of Chomsky (1991) that 'AgrS' and 'AgrO' are merely mnemonic.

In fact, there is even an argument, due to Postal (1974), and reiterated by Lasnik and Saito (1991), that object shift, like subject shift, is obligatory:

"Joan believes him, to be a genius even more fervently than Bob does
Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob does

*Joan believes him, to be a genius even more fervently than Bob's mother does
Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob's mother does"

Mary called up friends of John
Mary called friends of John up

Who did Mary call up friends of
Who did Mary call friends of up

Mary made John out to be a fool
Mary made out that John is a fool
Mary made out John to be a fool

The special prosecutor questioned two aides of a senator during each other's trials
??Which senator did the special prosecutor question two aides of during each other's trials
Which senator did the special prosecutor question two aides of during the president's trial

The mathematician proved few theorems about Mersenne numbers during any of the lectures
??Which numbers did the mathematician prove few theorems about during any of the lectures
Which numbers did the mathematician prove few theorems about during the conference lectures

These paradigms argue, contra Lasnik (1995), that when an object has overtly raised it is an island for extraction, and, therefore, since objects are not invariably islands, that such raising is optional.

Mary called up friends of John
Mary called friends of John up

Who did Mary call up friends of
Who did Mary call friends of up

Mary made John out to be a fool
Mary made out that John is a fool
Mary made out John to be a fool

An observation about scope that Zubizarreta (1982) attributes to Chomsky, and that is discussed again by Chomsky (1995) provides further evidence for the optionality of object shift with ECM subjects:

*Joan believes him, to be a genius even more fervently than Bob's, mother does
Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob's, mother does

(it seems that) everyone isn't there yet
everyone seems [\[\] not to be there yet]
Chomsky (p.327) argues as follows: "Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(85)a]... but not in [(85)b]", concluding that "...reconstruction in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears."

When the word order makes it clear that a universal ECM subject has raised, that subject cannot be interpreted inside the scope of negation in the complement clause, as seen in (88). [More on this later.] The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum of two primes

The alternative word order for (88), with every even number unraised, does allow narrow scope for the universal:

The mathematician made out every even number not to be the sum of two primes

I expected [everyone not to be there yet] Chomsky (1995)
I believe everyone not to have arrived yet
I proved every Mersenne number not to be prime
Everyone is believed not to have arrived yet
Every Mersenne number was proved not to be prime

I will return to the classic argument that there is A-movement scope reconstruction ('Quantifier Lowering'):

Someone is likely to solve the problem
It is likely that someone will solve the problem

For now, notice that QL is not always possible:
No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime
It was proven that no large Mersenne number is prime

No one is certain to solve the problem
It is certain that no one will solve the problem

The DA made no defense witnesses out to be credible
The DA made out that no defense witnesses were credible
The DA made out no defense witnesses to be credible
The DA proved no defense witnesses to be credible
No defense witnesses were proved to be credible by the DA

Note that if the ECM subject has to be 'high' in order to license some element in the higher clause, then the lower reading for that ECM subject becomes impossible:
The DA proved no defense witnesses to be credible during any of the trials

What of the argument for obligatoriness?
"Joan believes him, to be a genius even more fervently than Bob, does
It is not uncommon for 'object shift' to be obligatory with pronouns in a language even when it is optional with lexical NPs. Presumably, the pronoun movement is a different process, cliticization rather than object shift per se.

Mary made John out to be a fool
Mary made out John to be a fool
Mary made him out to be a fool
Mary made him out to be a fool
The detective brought him in
The detective brought in him Chomsky (1955)

One further potential argument for obligatoriness?
Tanaka (1999) claims that when a simple sentence contains both an interrogative direct object and an interrogative temporal expression, it is necessarily the former that undergoes wh-movement:

?Whom did the DA accuse during which trial
?During which trial did the DA accuse whom
Tanaka observes that Superiority, as subsumed under the Minimal Link Condition, accounts for this, but only if the direct object is necessarily higher than the temporal adverb.

On the other hand:
What did John buy when
When did John buy what Bošković (1997)

?Whom did the DA prove to be innocent during which trial
?During which trial did the DA prove whom to be innocent Tanaka (1999)

Whom did John prove to be guilty when
When did John prove whom to be guilty
Whom did the DA make out to be guilty when
When did the DA make whom out to be guilty
Whom did the DA make out whom to be guilty

One way to make the raising optional might be to abandon the idea that Agr is the same item as Agr, assuming, instead, that only the latter obligatorily has an EPP feature.

Some of the discussion in Chomsky (1995, p.350) hints at an alternative possibility. Chomsky reasons that "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." He thus suggests, in passing, that "Agr exists only when it has strong features."
Along these lines, suppose, then, that the optionality of raising is the optionality of Agr.

If Agr, 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.

Under circumstance (140)b, the nominal will not participate in high binding, nor will it survive as a Pseudogapping remnant.

This leaves us with the question of why Agr is obligatory. This is exactly the question of why the standard EPP holds, a question that, alas, remains as mysterious as ever.

III. On A-Movement Reconstruction

Earlier, we saw that 'reconstruction' with A-movement is often barred. This fact constituted part of the argument that object shift exists, and is optional.

But WHY does A-movement have this property?

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

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.

The effects of trace deletion follow from reconstruction in minimalist terms.

Deletion is possible only to turn an illegitimate LF object into a legitimate one, where the legitimate LF objects are:

Uniform chains (all of whose members are in A-positions; A'-positions; or X’-positions)

Operator-variable pairs.

Deletion is in the chain (Who, t', e) 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.

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.

On the other hand, long movement as in (154) will be an ECP violation, since the movement chain in this instance is uniformly A’, so economy prevents the deletion of t':

Similarly, ultra-long A-movement will also be properly excluded, even when the first step is 'short', as in (156):

This leaves us with the question of why Agr is obligatory. This is exactly the question of why the standard EPP holds, a question that, alas, remains as mysterious as ever.

But WHY does A-movement have this property?

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

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.

The effects of trace deletion follow from reconstruction in minimalist terms.
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Earlier, we saw that 'reconstruction' with A-movement is often barred. This fact constituted part of the argument that object shift exists, and is optional.

But WHY does A-movement have this property?
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(166)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.

(167) Then (157), repeated as (168), would be correctly excluded, but not because of an offending trace per se. The whole chain would be an offending one.

(168) *John seems [that [t, it was told t, [that ...]]]

(169) The account of (156), repeated as (170), remains unchanged.

(170) *John seems [that [it is likely [t' to be arrested t]]]

(171) Though the chain is legitimate, it contains an offending trace, one that now can’t be eliminated at all, since (170) doesn’t involve an operator chain.

(172) The major phenomenon originally motivating the uniform chain approach now loses its account. The offending intermediate trace in the case of argument movement (148) was deletable by virtue of being part of a non-uniform chain, while the corresponding offending trace in the case of adjunct movement (154), as part of a uniform chain, was not deletable.

(173) But in the new approach, deletability has nothing to do with uniformity. Rather, the intermediate trace in (148) deletes as a direct consequence of operator-variable formation. Similarly, the intermediate trace in (154) should be able to delete.

(174) Chomsky’s (class lectures, 1995) 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.

(175) *Ni xiangxin Lisi weisheme lai de shuofa? “You believe [the claim [that [Lisi came why]]]?”

(176) *John-wa Mary-ga naze sore-o katta kadooka siritagatte iru no? “John wants to know [whether [Mary bought it why]]”

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

(178)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.

(179) That they are not eliminated in A-constructions provided part of Chomsky’s account of the extreme ungrammaticality of ‘improper’ movement, as in (168).

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

(181) *John expected [him to seem to me [T izable intelligent]]

(182) "Under the relevant interpretation, ([181]) can only be understood as a Condition B violation, though under reconstruction the violation should be obviated, with him interpreted in the position of T ...” [p. 326]

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

(184) The requirement on him, that it be A-free in a local domain, could, in principle, be satisfied in θ in (183). Condition B is satisfied (incorrectly so), as Chomsky implies.

(185) *John, believes him, to be intelligent

(186) If him, the ‘ECM’ subject, is in the lower clause, then (185) is incorrectly not a Condition B violation. This can be taken as (additional) evidence that him raises into the higher clause.

(187) *Himself seems to him [T to be clever]

(188) Prior to movement, Condition A is presumably satisfied, since, as (189), from Chomsky (1995), shows, the (NP in the) to phrase c-commands into the complement infinitival (though for reasons that are not immediately clear).

(189) *They seem to him, [T to like John,]

(190) For Belletti and Rizzi (1988), (187) 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).

(191)a Chomsky’s (181) 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.

(192) Chomsky’s next argument that there is no A-movement reconstruction is based on a scope phenomenon briefly introduced above:

(193)a (it seems that) everyone isn’t there yet
b I expected [everyone not to be there yet]
c everyone seems [not to be there yet]

(194) "Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(193)a], and it seems in [(193)b] but not in [(193)c],... reconstruct-
tion in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears." Chomsky (1995, p.327)

(195)
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)

(196) School policy requires that everyone not get an A

(197) It is important for everyone not to get an A

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

(199) The only reading is the implausible one where the mathe-
matician 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 conjec-
ture is false).

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

(201) With undeniable overt raising, the scope reconstruction
at issue is unavailable.

(202) I believe everyone not to have arrived yet (*Neg>V)

(203) I proved every Mersenne number not to be prime (*Neg>V)

(204) Everyone is believed not to have arrived yet (*Neg>V)

(205) Every Mersenne number was proved not to be prime (*Neg>V)

(206) In (205), there is strong bias towards narrow scope, but
it is still not available. Only the wildly false wide
scope reading exists.

(207) How can we reconcile the substantial evidence that ECM
subjects undergo overt raising with the scope fact in
(202) - (203)?

(208)
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.

(209) Could it be that in the latter circumstance, overt rais-
ing has not taken place?

(210) Mary proved every Mersenne number not to be prime, and
John will every Fibonacci number

(211) The fact that every Fibonacci number is a Pseudogapping
remnant indicates that it has overtly raised. If, simul-
taneously, it could take scope under the (elided) nega-
tion as it can in (212), we would have a contradiction.

(212) John proved every Fibonacci number not to be prime

(213) However, it seems that unlike the situation in (212),
narrow scope is not possible for every Fibonacci number
in (210).

(214) (The ECM subject in the first conjunct in (210), 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).)

(215) We are seemingly led to the conclusion that raising must
be optional (a familiar, and agreeable, kind of conclu-
sion in GB analyses, but not in Minimalist ones).

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

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

(218)
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

(219)
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

(220)
a  The DA made no suspecti 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

(221) '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..."

(222) So what's going on with Quantifier Lowering?

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

(224) "[223] 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)
Chomsky distinguishes this phenomenon from the one found in (absence of) low scope under negation for a universal quantifier subject.

Chomsky (1995, p.327)

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

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

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.
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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.

A-movement typically creates an operator-variable relation, so at least an 'initial' trace is necessary. 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.

"In the phonological component, traces delete. We have found no reason to extend that convention to the N→\lambda computation, and indeed cannot; were we to do so, \theta-positions would be invisible at LF..." Chomsky (1995, p. 301)

Suppose that instead of being determined specifically at the LF level, \theta-roles are 'checked' in the course of a derivation.

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. (Note that this indicates that there is a specific level of LF, that information is not fed to the semantic component 'cyclically' in the course of the syntactic derivation. We will return to this.)

"...there should be no interaction between \theta-theory and the theory of movement." Chomsky (1995, p.312)

In particular, according to Chomsky, movement can never create a \theta-configuration.

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 \"\theta-relatedness is a 'base property'\" would be considerably more surprising and interesting.

A \theta-role is assigned in a certain structural configuration...

If \alpha raises to a \theta-position Th, forming the chain CH=(e,T), the argument that must bear a \theta-role is CH, not \alpha. But CH is not in any configuration, and \alpha is not an argument that can receive a \theta-role. [p.313]

Apparent unintended consequence: A-movement of an argument should never be permitted (assuming that \theta-role assignment is at LF).

Alternatively, \theta-roles are assigned prior to movement. But then whether A-movement leaves a trace or not is irrelevant to \theta-assignment.

In passing, I note that ironically, this conclusion undermines the argument against movement into a \theta-position. If an A-trace is not only not helpful in the assignment of a \theta-role, but would actually make such assignment impossible, then, obviously, the argument that such a trace must exist for \theta-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 \theta-position, it would still be in a 'configuration' in the relevant sense, so the \theta-role should be assignable.

IV. Feature Movement or Agreement at a Distance?

"The operation Move, we now assume, seeks to raise just F." Chomsky (1995, p. 262)

"...only PF convergence forces anything beyond features to raise." Chomsky (1995, p. 265)

"...simply define a strong feature as one that a derivation 'cannot tolerate': a derivation D-Σ is canceled if Σ contains a strong feature..."

"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."

"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..."

"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..."

"In MFL, Agree is analyzed in terms of feature-movement (Attract)....Here we...dispense with Attract...Checking reduces to deletion under matching..." Chomsky (in press, p.39)

"There is a single cycle; all operations are cyclic. Within narrow syntax, operations that have or lack phonetic effects are interspersed. There is no distinct LF component within narrow syntax...Agree alone, not com-
bined with Merge in the operation Move, can precede overt operations, contrary to the assumptions of MP and related work.” Chomsky (in press, pp.48-49)

There are certain constructions where deletion of (a category containing) an item is an alternative to the normally obligatory raising of that item. Feature movement can provide the basis for an account of this.

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

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

You might not believe me but you will Bob

NP-raising to Spec of Agrs ('Object Shift') is overt in English. [Koizumi (1993;1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)]

Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agrs followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]

Once the matching feature of the lower lexical V is 'attracted', the lower V becomes defective. A PF crash will be avoided if either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing the lower V (VP Deletion = Pseudogapping in the relevant instances) takes place.

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?
*Who Mary will see?

Who will Mary see?

Assume that matrix interrogative C contains the strong feature, with the matching feature of Infl raising overtly to check it. This leaves behind a phonologically defective Infl, which will cause a PF crash unless either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing that Infl (Sluicing) takes place.

How likely to win is John 

*How likely to be a riot is there 

Lasnik and Saito (1992), following Kroch and Joshi (1985)

*How likely [t to be a riot] is there 

Lambek (1985)

*How likely [t to be a man outside] [z is [z there ... ]

"a man" must replace "there" in LF (as in Chomsky (1986)), but this movement is illicit here, being sideways. Barss (1986)

Expletive replacement cannot be correct, as shown by the paradigms considered earlier. But the essence of Barss's account can be maintained under the feature movement analysis: The agreement features of Infl must be checked, and "there" has no agreement features of its own.

*How likely [t to be a man outside] [z is [z there ... ]

Note that this account, for better or for worse, thus demands a separate LF cycle for feature movement, as in the GB 'T-model'.

There is [very likely [t to be [a man outside]]]

*[F]

_______________

Certain heads have a strong feature, demanding overt movement for checking. Chomsky (1995, Ch. 4)

Certain heads require Spec's. Chomsky (in press; 1981)

No such account is available on the long distance agreement theory:

There is [how likely [t to be [a man outside]]]

✓[F]
Chomsky, Noam. 1994. Bare phrase structure. MIT occasional papers in linguistics. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT.
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(328) \[ \text{CP} \]
| \[ \text{C'} \]
| \[ \text{C} \]
| \[ \text{IP} \]
| \[ \text{EPP F} \]
| \[ \text{NP} \]
| \[ \text{I'} \]
| \[ \text{I VP} \]
| \[ \text{will} \]
| \[ \text{V'} \]
| \[ \text{press} \]
| \[ \text{V NP} \]
| \[ \text{see who} \]
| \[ \text{F} \]

(329) Mary will see someone. *Tell me Mary will see who.

(330) Interrogative C requires a Spec. Even in a theory where feature movement exists, it does not suffice for C to check its 'EPP feature'.


