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I. Last Resort and Move a

(1) *I believe John to be likely [£ will win]
(2) *John is likely [£ will win]
(3) Last resort relative to what?
(4) I believe it to be likely John will win
(5) It is likely John will win

(6) Chomsky (1994): derivations will be compared if and only if they involve all the same lexical choices (the same 'numeration').

(7) *I believe __ to be likely John will win
(8) __ is likely John will win

(9) The movement of an item a is driven exclusively by requirements of a itself, even if failure to move results in a 'crashed' derivation, as in (7), (8); 'Greed'.

(10) __ seems to [a strange man] [that it is raining outside]
(11) *A strange man seems to [ that it is raining outside

(12) If the derived subjects in (1), (2) and (11) have already had their Case checked before they move to subject position, the nominative Case feature of Tense ((2), (11)) or the accusative Case feature of believe (11) will never be checked, and that will cause the derivation to crash. Greed is superfluous.

(13) *It is believed [a man to seem to £ that S]
(14) *There is likely [someone to be [£ here]]
(15) [£, to be [£ someone here]]

(16) At stage (15), there is a choice: it is possible to fill the Spec of y by selecting there from the numeration and inserting it, or by raising someone. Chomsky argues that the latter move would violate Procrastinate.

(17) Procrastinate: LF movement is preferred to overt movement.
(18) There is likely to be someone here

(19) *It is believed [a man to seem to £ that S]
(20) [£, to seem to a man that S]
(21) It is believed [£ to seem to a man that S]

(22) *John, Infl [w £, HIT £]
(23) John has originated in complement position, picking up the object 0-role of the verb, then moved to Spec of VP, picking up the subject role, on its way to Spec of IP.

(24) The economy condition 'shortest move' might demand, hence license, the step of movement through Spec of VP, so even Greed wouldn't rule out (22).

(25)a John washed (=John washed himself)
b John shaved (=John shaved himself)
c John dressed (=John dressed himself)

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

(27) [a man [there]] Agr is [£ here]
(28) Is this a Spec-head relation?

(29) If any version of last resort is correct, the movement must satisfy some formal requirement of some item. Two possibilities: a) there is an LF affix, and the stranded affix constraint provides the driving force; b) there lacks Φ-features, yet the Φ-features of AGR must be checked.

(30)a Greed: Movement of a to β must be for the satisfaction of formal requirements of a.
b 'Enlightened Self Interest': Movement of a to β must be for the satisfaction of formal requirements of a or β.

(31) Who bought what
(32) *What did who buy

(33) I believe John to be clever

(34) On standard assumptions about the structure of (33), there must be some strong feature of non-finite tense driving the overt movement of John to subject position. But the relevant feature is not a Case feature, since Case in ECM constructions is checked in the Spec of the higher Agr, in association with believe.

(35) John is believed [£ to be likely [£ to be arrested £]]

(36) Greed is 'global'. Presumably John must move through the intermediate £ positions in order for it to successfully arrive at its ultimate goal: the nominative Case checking position in the highest clause.

(37) In this respect Enlightened Self Interest is actually a stronger constraint than Greed. If an instance of movement of a to β can be driven by the needs of β (the feature instantiating the EPP, in the instances under discussion), the computation can be strictly local.
II. Last Resort and Attract F

سينما progeny the semantic difficulty that Chomsky attributes to
(38) with a strange man in situ might arise even if a
strange man were to move.

(39) Perhaps the semantic difficulty that Chomsky attributes to
(38) with a strange man in situ might arise even if a
strange man were to move.

(40) Possible alternative: there must be an affix on an NP with
partitive Case (in the sense of Belletti (1988)).

II. Last Resort and Attract F

(41) If movement is feature driven, all else equal, movement should
never be of an entire syntactic category, but only of its
formal features.

(42) PF requirements will normally force movement of a category
containing the formal features (pied-piping) under the
assumption that a bare feature (or set of features) is an
ill-formed PF object.

(43) For PF movement pied-piping will normally not be necessary,
however, 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.]

(44) In (45), the associate someone does not actually move to
there.

(45) There is someone here

(46) The movement of features is driven by the unchecked 0-features
of Agr, there lacking agreement features of its own, (29)b
above.

(47) Assume with Chomsky that any visible feature of a head can
'attract' a corresponding feature, resulting in the movement
of a bundle of formal features (LF movement) or a syntactic
constituent (overt movement). [This is in the spirit of
Enlightened Self Interest rather than Greed.]

(48) But in addition suppose that it is exactly a visible (i.e.,
unchecked) Case feature that makes the feature bundle or
constituent available for 'A-movement'. Once Case is
checked off, no further A-movement is possible.

(49) *The belief [a man to seem [t is [t here]]

(50) *John BELIEVES [a man to seem [t is [t here]]

(51) There is a man here

(52) If Belletti (1988) is correct, the specific Case borne by the
associate of there is one with semantic import. It would
then not be checked-off even if it participated in checking.
Being not merely a formal feature, it would survive to the
IF interface level, so would be visible throughout the
syntactic derivation.

(53) There aren't many linguistics students here

(54) Pictures of many students aren't here

(55) Pictures of few students are here

(56) There are few linguistics students here

(57) When 2 adjoins to 3, 3 becomes a segmented category, and 2 o-
commands anything that prior to the adjunction.

(58) If in LF, only the formal features of many linguistics
students move to a functional head or heads above negation,
it is reasonable to conclude that the quantificational
properties remain below negation. Then, if it is this
structure that determines scope (that is, if QR either
cannot alter these hierarchical relations or does not exist)
the desired results are obtained.

(59) Many linguistics students aren't [ t here]

(60) There aren't many linguistics students here

(61) a *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene]
during each other's trials

b *The DA proved [there to be none at the scene] during any of
the trials

(62) Some linguists seem to each other [ t to have been given good
job offers]

(63) *There seem to each other [ t to have been given some linguists
given good job offers]

(64) No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [ t to
have been formulated]

(65) *There seem to any philosophers [ t to have been no good
linguistic theories formulated]

(66) When movement is overt, the properties (referential,
quantificational, etc.) relevant to licensing an anaphor or
negative polarity item or determining scope will be in the
required structural position. When the movement is covert,
only the formal features (Case, agreement) raise.

(67) a The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during
each other's trials

b The DA proved [noone to be at the scene] during any of
the trials

(68) a ?*The DA proved [that the defendants were guilty] during each
other's trials

b ?*The DA proved [that none of the defendants were guilty]
during any of the trials

(69) a The FBI proved few students to be spies

b The FBI proved that few students were spies

(70) a *Joan believes [him to be a genius] even more fervently than
Bob, does

b Joan believes [he is a genius] even more fervently than Bob,
does

(71) A virtual contradiction: The phenomena in (59)-(65) argue
that when raising is in LF, only the formal features (Case,
agreement) of an NP raise, leaving behind those properties
involved in anaphora, scope, etc. But (67), (69) and (70) argue that referential and scopal properties in ECM constructions do raise, along with the formal features.

(72) The relevant movement in the there constructions is covert, so only the features move. For all other purposes, it is as if no movement took place. For ECM constructions, also, the standard Minimalist assumption is that the movement is covert. Thus the paradox. But Koizumi (1993,1995), revising and extending ideas of Johnson (1991), argues that accusative Case is checked overtly in English, just like nominative Case. The accusative NP overtly raises to Spec of Agr 0 (with V raising to a still higher head position). The paradoxical asymmetry is immediately reduced to the independent pied-piping asymmetry.

(73) John will select me, and Bill will you
(74) John could pull you out of a plane, like he did his brother.
(75) Mary hasn't dated Bill, but she has Harry.
(76) The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty.
(77) Mary hasn't dated Bill, but she has Harry dated.

Even worse, Procrastinate should then block (77), where, by hypothesis, raising of V is overt.

(80) Suppose that the relevant strong feature driving raising of V is a feature of the V itself (perhaps a θ-feature, plausible under Koizumi's split VP hypothesis). And suppose, following Chomsky (1993) but contra Chomsky (1994), that an un checked strong feature is an ill-formed PF object (rather than an ill-formed LF object). Under the assumption that ellipsis phenomena truly do involve deletion, ellipsis of (a category containing) an item with an unchecked strong feature salvages a derivation that would otherwise crash at PF. In the present case, the strong feature of dated in (77) is not checked overtly, so the PF is ill-formed. In (77), repeated as (82), on the other hand, the unraised dated does not survive to the level of PF, as it is deleted.

(83) The LF will also be well-formed, since in the LF component, the V can raise, checking its own checkable features and those of the functional heads it raises to.
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