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(1) The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials
(2) The DA proved [no suspect, to have been at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(3) The DA proved [no one to have been at the scene] during any of the trials
(4) *The DA proved [that two men were at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials
(5) *The DA proved [that no suspect, was at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(6) *The DA proved [that no one was guilty] during any of the trials
(7) The DA accused two men during each other's trials
(8) The DA discredited no suspect, during his trial
(9) The DA cross-examined none of the witnesses during any of the trials
(10) Which book that John read did he like
(11) *He liked every book that John read
(12) *I don't remember who thinks that he read which book that John likes
(13) Chomsky (1981): S-structure is crucial to at least one of the binding conditions, Condition C.
(14) Barss (1986) draws the same conclusion for Condition A, based on examples like the following:
(15) John wonders which picture of himself Mary showed to Susan
(16) *John wonders who showed which picture of himself to Susan
(17) 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.
(18) Lasnik and Saito (1991) and den Dikken (1995) draw the same conclusion about the 'expletive replacement' operation proposed by Chomsky (1986):
(19) *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene of the crime] during each other's trials
(20) *The DA proved [there to have been no suspect, at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(21) *The DA proved [there to have been no one at the scene]
during any of the trials

(22) Under the 'split-VP' hypothesis of Koizumi (1993, 1995):
(23) She will prove Bob to be guilty
(24) AgrP
   / \ NP AgrS'
   she / \ prove / \ AgrS TP
   / \ T VP
   will / \ AgrP VP
   prove / \ NP AgrS'
   Bob / \ AgrS VP
   prove / \ AgrP VP
   prove / \ NP to be guilty
   Bob

(25) If the adverbials in (1)-(3) are attached in the vicinity of the lower matrix VP, the binding and licensing receive a natural account.
(26) It is now natural to assume that the 'EPP' feature 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.
(27) An additional argument for overt raising of an object or an ECM subject: Pseudogapping as VP ellipsis (Jayaseelan (1990)), with the remnant having raised to Spec of AgrO.
(28) Mary hired John, and Susan will hire Bill
(29) The DA proved Jones (to be) guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith (to be) guilty.

(30) Unaccusatives show similar behavior, both for binding and for Pseudogapping:

(31) There arrived two knights on each other's horses.

(32) There arrived an instructor but there didn't arrive a professor.

(33) So object shift is possible. Is it obligatory?

(34) Joan believes him to be a genius even more fervently than Bob does.

(35) Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob does.

(36) But there are arguments that object shift does not always take place.

(37) Who was [a picture of ] selected?

(38) Who did you select [a picture of ]

(39) If object and subject both raise overtly, to [Spec, AgrS] and [Spec, AgrO] respectively, the CED cannot distinguish (37) from (38).

(40) Uriagereka (1988) attributes this kind of object shift to Chomsky (1995), when the object is a Pseudogapping remnant, extraction from it is seriously degraded:

(41) Bill selected a painting of John, and Susan should select a photograph of Mary.

(42) *Who will Bill select a painting of, and who will Susan select a photograph of?

(43) The special prosecutor questioned two aides of a senator during each other's trials.

(44) Which senator did the special prosecutor question two friends of during each other's trials?

(45) Which senator did the special prosecutor question two friends of during the president's trial?

(46) The mathematician proved few theorems about Mersenne numbers during any of the lectures.

(47) Which numbers did the mathematician prove few theorems about during any of the lectures?

(48) Which numbers did the mathematician prove few theorems during the conference lectures?

(49) 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.

(50) Mary called up friends of John.

(51) *Mary called friends of John up.

(52) Who did Mary call up friends of?

(53) *Who did Mary call friends of up?

(54) Mary made John out to be a fool.

(55) Mary made out that John is a fool.

(56) Mary made out John to be a fool.

(57) 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:

(58) a (it seems that) everyone isn't there yet

b everyone seems [to not be there yet]

(59) Chomsky (p.327) argues as follows: "Negation can have wide scope over the Q in [(58)a]... but not in [(58)b]", concluding that "...reconstruction in the A-chain does not take place, so it appears."

(60) 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 (61).

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

(62) The alternative word order for (61), with every even number unreased, does allow narrow scope for the universal:

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

(64) I expected [everyone not to be there yet] to be prime.

(65) I believe everyone not to have arrived yet.

(66) I proved every Mersenne number not to be prime.

(67) Everyone is believed not to have arrived yet.

(68) Every Mersenne number was proved not to be prime.

(69) Someone is likely to solve the problem.

(70) It is likely that someone will solve the problem.

(71) No large Mersenne number was proven to be prime.

(72) (71) cannot accurately be paraphrased by (73).

(73) It was proven that no large Mersenne number is prime.

(74) No one is certain to solve the problem.

(75) It is certain that no one will solve the problem.

(76) The DA made no defense witnesses out to be credible.

(77) The DA made out that no defense witnesses were credible.

(78) The DA made out no defense witnesses to be credible.

(79) The DA proved no defense witnesses to be credible.

(80) 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:

*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.

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 out him to be a fool

The detective brought him in

The detective brought in him

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.

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

Bošković (1997)

Whom did the DA make out to be guilty when

*When did the DA make whom out to be guilty

Bošković (1997)

When did you call whom up

When did you call up whom

One way to make the raising optional might be to abandon the idea that Agr is the same item as Agrs, 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.

This leaves us with the question of why Agrs is obligatory. This is exactly the question of why the standard EPP holds, and, unfortunately, this journey has taken us no closer to an answer.
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