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I. Covert A-relations

(1)a There is/*are a man here
   b There are/*is men here

(2) There is a man here  S-structure
(3) A man is there      LF          Chomsky (1986)
(5)a  Some linguists seem to each other [t to have been given good job offers]
    b *There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists given good job offers]

(6)a  No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [t to have been formulated]
    b *There seem to any philosophers [t to have been no good linguistic theories formulated]

(7)a  Some defendant, seems to his lawyer [t to have been at the scene]
    b *There seems to his lawyer [t to have been some defendant, at the scene]

(8) "The operation Move...seeks to raise just F."   Chomsky (1995)
(9) 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. 
    (somewhat extending a proposal of Chomsky (1995))
(10) All else equal, movement should never be of an entire syntactic category, but only of its formal features.
(11) When movement is overt, because driven by a strong feature, PF requirements will normally force movement of a category containing the formal features, via pied-piping.
(12) For LF movement, on the other hand, pied-piping will normally not be necessary, hence, by economy, will not even be possible. Only the formal features will move, and they will move exactly to the heads that have matching features. [Procrastinate now becomes a true economy principle; moving less material is more economical than moving more.] In a standard existential sentence like (13), then, the associate someone does not actually move to there.
(13) There is someone here
(52) The movement of features in this case is driven by the (weak) unchecked Φ-features of Agr, there lacking agreement features of its own.

(14) Chomsky (2000) presents a different, even more minimal, theory of covert operations, one that provides an alternative treatment for the binding and licensing paradigms above.
(15) "In MP, Agree is analyzed in terms of feature-movement (Attract)....Here we...dispense with Attract...Checking reduces to deletion under matching..." Chomsky (2000)
(16) "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 combined with Merge in the operation Move, can precede overt operations, contrary to the assumptions of MP and related work." Chomsky (2000)

(17) 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.

II. Pseudogapping

(18)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)
(19)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
(20) You might not believe me but you will Bob
(21) NP-raising to Spec of Agr, ('Object Shift') is overt in English. [Koizumi (1993;1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)]
(22) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr, followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]
This complementarity between normally obligatory movement (raising of V) and ellipsis thus receives a rather straightforward account in terms of feature movement. It is not clear how this would be expressed if feature movement were eliminated from the theory in favor of long distance agreement.

III. Sluicing

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

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

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

(33) *Who Mary will see?
(35) 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.

(37) This complementarity between normally obligatory movement (raising of Infl) and ellipsis thus receives a rather straightforward account in terms of feature movement. It is not clear how this would be expressed if feature movement were eliminated from the theory in favor of long distance agreement.

IV. A Constraint on One Type of Remnant Movement

(38) How likely to win is John
(39) *How likely to be a riot is there Lasnik and Saito (1992), following Kroch and Joshi (1985)

(40) [How likely [PRO to win]] is John

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.
(41) *[How likely [t to be a riot]] is there [out by Proper Binding Condition]
(42) *[How likely [t to be a man outside]] [z is [z there ... ]
(43) "a man" must replace "there" in LF (as in Chomsky (1986)), but this movement is illicit here, being sideways. Barss (1986)
(44) Expletive replacement cannot be correct, as shown by the paradigms in I. 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.
(45) *[How likely [t to be a man outside]] [z is [z there ... ]
(46) No such account is available on the long distance agreement theory:
(47) There is [how likely [ to be [a man outside]]]
(48) Note that this account, for better or for worse, thus demands a separate LF cycle for feature movement, as in the T-model.
(49) [There is [very likely [t to be [a man outside]]]]

V. The EPP

(50) Certain heads have a strong feature, demanding overt movement for checking. Chomsky (1995, Ch. 4)
(52) AgrP
   / \ AgrP
    /   \ TP
   NP she
     /   \ AgrTP
    /     \ VP
   T will
   /     \ V'
     NP
    |     |

(53) Mary said she won't sing, although she will sing

(54) AgrP
   / \ AgrP
    /   \ TP
   NP she
     /   \ AgrTP
    /     \ VP
   T will
   /     \ V'
     NP
    |     |

(55) *Mary said she won't sing, although will she sing

(56) Agr (or T) requires a Spec. It does not suffice to check its 'EPP feature'.

(57) Mary will see someone. Tell me who Mary will see.

(58) CP
   / \ C'
    /   \ C
   [EPP F] / \ IP
   NP Mary / \ I'
   will / \ V
   |     |
   V NP see
   who |

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

(60) Interrogative C requires a Spec. It does not suffice to check its 'EPP feature'.
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