I. Ellipsis and island violation repair

(1) I believe that he bit someone, but they don't know who
(2a) *I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who I believe the claim that he bit
(2b) (??) I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who
(3a) *Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who Irv and were dancing together [Coordinate Structure Constraint]
(3b) (??) Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who
(4a) *She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends
(4b) She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends
(5a) *That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who that he'll hire is possible [Sentential Subject Constraint]
(5b) (??) That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who

All above from Ross (1969)

(6a) *I don't know which children he has plans to send to college
(6b) He has plans to send some of his children to college, but I don't know which ones Chomsky (1972)

(7) I don't know CP
    NP
     which children
    IP
      T
        he
        I
        V
        NP*
    has plans to send t to college

II. Trace deletion: Subjacency vs. ECP

(8) Chomsky's suggestion [see also Lakoff (1970), Baker and Brane (1972), Lakoff (1972)] is that * (# in Chomsky's presentation) is assigned to an island when it is crossed by a movement operation (the complex NP in (7)). If a later operation (Sluicing in this case) deletes a category containing the *-marked item, the derivation is salvaged.

(9) For Chomsky (1972), the condition banning * applies at surface structure. The results are the same if, instead, it is a PF condition, as suggested by Lasnik (1995b), Lasnik (In press).

(10) I know that he must be proud of it, but I don't know how proud (he must be of it)
(11) *I know that he must be proud of it, but I don't know how (he must be proud of it) Ross (1969)

(13) Another possibility is that LBC is not, in itself, different, but that in (11), we have not a mere Subjacency violation, but an ECP violation (since the moving item is not an argument). And the ECP is known to hold at LF.

(14) Johnny stole someone's wallet, but I forget whose (wallet)
(15) ............................................whose (pro) Ross (1969)

(16) ?The speaker discussed some linguist and some philosopher's theory, but I can't remember which linguist (*the speaker discussed and some philosopher's theory)

(17) *They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)
(18) *They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they do
(19) They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they want to hear a lecture about
(20) *They want the students to attend a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do

II. Trace deletion: Subjacency vs. ECP

(21) ??Who do you wonder [whether [IR John said [IR I solved the problem]]]

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

(24) 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.

(25) 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.

(26) On the other hand, long movement as in (27) will be an ECP violation, since the movement chain in this instance is uniformly A', so economy prevents the deletion of t':

(27) *How do you wonder [John whether [Mary solved the problem t]]

(28) Not a great analysis, perhaps, but it has one advantage over virtually all existing alternatives: It works.

(29) Similarly, ultra-long A-movement will also be properly excluded, even when the first step is 'short', as in (30), with its uniform A-chain:

(30) *John seems [that [it is likely to be arrested t]]

(31) There is a potential problem with this account of long A-movement. Chomsky (1995) and Lasnik (1999a) point out several circumstances where A-movement fails to display reconstruction effects. Based on this, and on the fact that the trace of A-movement has little, if any, semantic work to do, Lasnik (1999a) proposes that A-movement doesn't leave a trace.

(32) a (it seems that) everyone isn't there yet
b everyone seems [t] not to be there yet

(33) "Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(32)a], ... but not in [(32)c],... reconstruction in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears." Chomsky (1995, p.327)

(34) Possible answer, based on a conjecture of Lasnik (1994):
If a bad movement must put a * on a chain, and if the chain has no trace, then the * goes on the moving item itself.

III. Strong features, defective PF objects, and ellipsis
A. Pseudogapping

(35) 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)

(36) 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

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

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

(39) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr$_S$ followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]

(40) 

(41) 

(42) *You will Bob believe
(43) *The Assistant DA will Smith prove guilty
**IV. A consequence for the EPP**

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

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

(55) Agr,P / \ 
    NP Agr,' 
   you / \ 
    Agr,v TP / \ 
   T VP will / \ 
   NP v' / \ 
   t / \ 
   v Agr,P [strong F] / \ 
   NP Agr,' 
  Bob / \ 
    Agr,v VP / \ 
   V' / \ 
   v NP believe t [F]

B. Sluicing

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

(47) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
    Speaker B: I wonder who Mary will see.

(48) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
    Speaker B: Who Mary will see?

(49) CP / \ 
    CP
   who / \ 
    C IP [strong F] / \ 
   NP I' 
  Mary / \ 
    I VP will / \ 
   CP [F] V' / \ 
   v NP see t

**V. A problem for 'Inclusiveness'?**

(60) "...any structure formed by the computation ... is constituted of elements already present in lexical items selected for N; no new objects are added in the course of computation apart from rearrangements of lexical properties..." Chomsky (1995, p.228)
(61) "... a "*-feature, which is not a lexical feature – since it appears nowhere in the lexicon – ... enters into a derivation as the output of certain movements. It is this assumption that violates the Inclusiveness Condition." Kitahara (1999, p.79)

(62a) An expression is marginally deviant if its derivation employs an MLC-violating application of Attract.

(62b) An expression is severely deviant if its derivation employs an MLC-violating application of Attract that forms a legitimate LF object as its output. Kitahara (1999)

(63) "The marginal deviance of [long argument movement] follows from [(62)a]. Notice that ... there is no need to mark anything in the course of a derivation." Kitahara (1999, p.80)

(64) "The severe deviance of [long adjunct movement] follows from [(62)b]. Here again, there is no need to mark anything in the course of a derivation." Kitahara (1999, p.81)
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