I. Introduction

1. "The operation Move, we now assume, seeks to raise just F." Chomsky (1995, p. 262)

2. "...only PF convergence forces anything beyond features to raise." Chomsky (1995, p. 265)

3. "...simply define a strong feature as one that a derivation D-Σ is canceled if Σ contains a strong feature..."

4. "A strong feature...triggers a rule that eliminates it: [strength] is associated with a pair of operations, one that introduces it into the derivation...a second that (quickly) eliminates it."

5. "For the most part - perhaps completely - it is properties of the phonological component that require pied-piping. Isolated features and other scattered parts of words may not be subject to its rules, in which case the derivation is canceled; or the derivation might proceed to PF with elements that are 'unpronounceable,' violating PI." Chomsky (1995)

6. "Just how broadly considerations of PF convergence might extend is unclear, pending better understanding of morphology and the internal structure of phrases. Note that such considerations could permit raising without pied-piping even overtly, depending on morphological structure..."

7. "In MP, Agree is analyzed in terms of feature-movement (Attract)...Here we...dispense with Attract...Checking reduces to deletion under matching..." Chomsky (in press, p.39)

8. "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 (in press, pp.48-49)

II. Pseudogapping

10. 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)

11. 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 ø a lot of money
    Chomsky (in press, pp.39)

12. You might not believe me but you will Bob

13. NP-raising to Spec of Agr₀ ('Object Shift') is overt in English. [Koizumi (1993;1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)]

14. Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr₀ followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]
(17) *You will Bob believe
(18) *The Assistant DA will Smith prove guilty

(19) AgrP
    /
   /\   
  NP  AgrP'
  you /  
AgrP  TP
   /\   
  T   VP
  will /  
  NP  V'
  t /   
  V  AgrP
 [strong F] /   
  NP  AgrP'
  Bob /   
AgrP  VP
  |   
  V'   
  /   
  V  VP
  believe  t
[F]

(20) 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.

III. Sluicing

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

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

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

(24) CP
    /   
   /\   
  NP  C'
  who  /   
C  IP
 [strong F] /   
  NP  I'
 Mary /   
I  VP
 will  |
  [F]  V'
    /   

(25) *Who Mary will see?
(26) Who will Mary see?

(27) 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.

IV. On the Overtness of Object Shift in English

(28) Infl-raising to C is uncontroversially overt in normal matrix interrogatives. NP-raising to Spec of Agr., on the other hand, is standardly assumed to be covert in English. Lasnik (1995b), based on Lasnik and Saito (1991) [see also Postal (1974) and Wyngaerd (1989)] and den Dikken (1995), argues that such movement is, indeed, overt.

(29)a There is a man here
b There are men here

(30)a Many linguistics students aren't here
b There aren't many linguistics students here

(31)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]

(32)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]

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

(34) "The operation Move...seeks to raise just F." Chomsky (1995)

(35) 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. Lasnik (1995b) (contra Chomsky (1995), at least in part)

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

(38) The DA questioned noone during any of the trials
(39) a The DA proved [noone to be at the scene] during any of the trials
   b *The DA proved [there to be noone at the scene] during any of the trials

(40) The DA questioned no suspect during his trial
(41) a The DA proved [no suspect to be at the scene of the crime] during his trial
   b *The DA proved [there to be no suspecti at the scene of the crime] during his trial

(42) One further argument: Given the feature movement theory of covert movement, if an instance of movement creates a new ellipsis configuration, that movement must be overt. (This is true whether ellipsis is PF deletion or LF copying.)

V. The EPP

(43) Certain heads have a strong feature, demanding overt movement for checking. Chomsky (1995, Ch. 4)

(45) \[V] Agr\_SP
     /   \                 \[EPP F]\nNP  Agr\_T'                  /   \                      /   \       \\
  she                        T    VP            I'     \\
                      /   \                          /   \\
T                  NP  V'
                      /   \\
will                V  see
                          /   \\
sleep               who
                           [F]

(46) Mary said she won't sleep, although she will sleep

(47) Agr\_SP
     /   \                         \[strong F]\nNP  Agr\_T'                  /   \
  she                        T    VP
                      /   \                          /   \\
T                  NP  V'
                      /   \\
will                V  sleep
                          /   \\
[strong F]

(48) *Mary said she won't sleep, although will she sleep

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

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

(51) CP
     \      \        \[EPP F]\nC'  /   \     /   \      /   \\
/     /    IP    NP I'
     /   \      I    VP
     /   \\
Mary    /   \          \\
   I      V
   /   \\
VP  see
     /   \\
who
     [F]

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

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

VI. A Constraint on One Type of Remnant Movement

(54) How likely to win is John
(55) *How likely to be a riot is there Lasnik and Saito (1992), following Kroch and Joshi (1985)
(56) [How likely [PRO to win]] is John
(57) *[How likely [t to be a riot]] is there [out by Proper Binding Condition]
(58) *How likely to be a man outside is there
(59) "a man" must replace "there" in LF (as in Chomsky (1986)), but this movement is illicit here, being sidewards. Barss (1986)
(60) Expletive replacement cannot be correct, as shown by the paradigms in IV. But the essence of Barss's account can be maintained under the feature movement analysis.
(61) There is [very likely [to be [a man outside]]]
(62) There is [how likely [to be [a man outside]]]
(63) Note that this account, for better or for worse, demands a separate LF cycle for feature movement, as in the T-model.
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