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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 t here  LF  Chomsky (1986)


(5) a There 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.

(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

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

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

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?

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.

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

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 [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 [t 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
   \ /           \ /
   NP she / \ Agr_s TP
   / \           / \ Agr_s TP
           / \ T VP
           / \  will NP V'
           |   V t

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

(54) AgrP
   \ /           \ /
   Agr_s TP
   / \           / \ [strong F] / \ T will VP
   / \ NP she | V'
   [F] sing

(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' /
   \ / IP
   [EPP F] / \ NP I'
   / \ Mary / \ I VP
   / \ will |
   / \ V NP
   / \ see who
   [F] sing

(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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