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1. Introduction

Noun Phrase Licensing and Interpretation was the author's dissertation submitted to University of Massachusetts in 1995, which was published as Noun Phrase Licensing by Garland Publishing, Inc. in 1998. Since "[m]ost of the research reported here was done in 1993 and 1994," "[t]he present work is couched in terms of this earlier minimalist program" (p. xi), which is crucially based on the existence of AGR. The assumption that the present dissertation attempts to defend and justify is the following:

(1) Direct objects in English move overtly to a Case position external to VP. (p. 3)

To see the point, let us consider the following example:

(2) John plays tennis.

In Runner's overt object raising analysis (henceforth, the OR analysis), example (2) is assigned a structure such as (3), whereas in the nonrais-
ing analysis (henceforth, the NR analysis), it is assigned a structure like (4) (Chomsky (1999)):¹

(3) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AGR}sP \\
\text{John} & \text{AGR}s' \\
\text{AGR}s & \text{TP} \\
\text{T} & \text{FP} \\
\text{V+F} & \text{AGR}oP \\
\text{plays} & \text{tennis} & \text{AGR}o' \\
\text{AGR}o & \text{VP} \\
\text{t}_i & \text{V'} \\
\end{array}
\]

In (3), the object raises overtly to SPEC-AGRo to have its Case feature checked, and the verb (or the \([\text{AGR}o \ plays + \text{AGR}o]\) complex

¹ As noted by Runner, AGR, lacking an independent Case feature, is provided with a Case feature “by the V or T that adjoins to it” (Chomsky (1995: 349)). In (3), therefore, V and T have to adjoin to AGRo and AGRs, respectively (cf. Runner (1998: 207)), although most of his structures have these details omitted.
(Koizumi (1995: 31), Radford (1997: 434))) raises to F to derive the surface order Verb-Object. In (4), on the other hand, _tennis_ remains in its base-generated position and has its Case feature deleted under Agree by the light verb v*.

Runner observes that the grammaticality of (5) shows that the bracketed strings behave like constituents for coordination, and that the grammaticality of (6) indicates that _to Bill after dinner_ is a constituent:

(5) Mary told the story [VP t v to Bill before breakfast] and [VP t v to Sam after dinner]. (Coordination) (p. 57)

(6) Mary told the story, and Sam explained the problem, [VP t v to Bill after dinner]. (Right Node Raising) (p. 58)

Given that “both the verb and the object are VP-external at S-structure” (p. 57), Runner maintains, the facts in (5) and (6) follow straightforwardly.

Whether direct objects in English move overtly to a Case position or not has been one of the most controversial issues in the minimalist program. In what follows, I would like to examine Runner’s major arguments for the assumption (1), and then I will proceed to point out a number of problems with his arguments. I will also consider some theoretical consequences of the assumption (1) for the minimalist program with respect to an economy principle (Chomsky (1995: 294)), the Minimal Structure Principle (Bošković (1996, 1997)), and Greed (Chomsky (1994, 1995)).

2. Arguments for Overt Object Raising

Runner’s arguments for the assumption (1) concern adverb placement, the ECM construction, and the double object construction among others.

2.1. Adverb Placement

We will start by considering his arguments concerning adverb placement. Relevant examples include the following:

(7) a. Sam talked quietly to Carol about Oliver.

Runner (1998: 64)

b. *Cindy showed quietly the book to Jan. (ibid.)

According to Runner, examples (7a, b) are assigned structures such as (8a, b), respectively:

(8) a. \[\text{AGR}_{sp} \text{Sami TP T } \text{FP } \text{F talked F} \] [VP quietly [VP t_i [v' [v'

b. \[\text{AGR}_{sp} \text{Cindy TP T } \text{FP } \text{F showed F} \] [VP quietly [VP t_i [v' [v'

(Runner (1998: 64))
Observing that in (8a), the adverb quietly has adjoined to VP, whereas in (8b), it has to adjoin to AGRoP since the object has raised to SPEC-AGRo, Runner argues that the deviance of (7b) (= (8b)) can be accounted for in terms of the restriction that the adverb quietly cannot adjoin to AGRoP.

2.2. The ECM Construction

There has been controversy about the ECM construction among linguists working within the minimalist framework. In particular, the ECM construction has been shown to be problematic for Greed as stated in (9), as noted by some linguists, including Lasnik (1995a, b, c):

(9) Greed
Move raises α to a position β only if morphological properties of α itself would not otherwise be satisfied in the derivation.  
(Chomsky (1994: 400))

To clarify the point, let us consider the following example:

(10) I believe [α John to be [t clever]].  
(Lasnik (1995b: 10))

Overt movement of John to SPEC-α in (10) violates Greed, since it is not driven by the requirements of the moved element, but driven by the need to check the EPP-feature in the infinitival clause, as noted by Lasnik (1995a, b, c).

Runner states that "movement to the matrix Spec, AGRo ... is exactly analogous to movement to Spec, AGRs ... in a finite clause" (p. 97) as shown in the following:

(11) a. Laverne believes [AGRoP Shirley [AGRsP to have been arrested [VP tv ti]]]  
(p. 97)

b. [AGRsP Shirley has been arrested [VP tv ti]]  
(ibid.)

(12) a. Richie expects [AGRoP Ralph to arrive [VP tv ti]]  
(ibid.)

b. [AGRsP Ralph arrived [VP tv ti]]  
(ibid.)

It should be noted that movement of Shirley to SPEC-AGRs in (11b) and movement of Ralph to SPEC-AGRs in (12b) are driven by the need to check the Case features of the moved elements in accordance with Greed. Similarly, movement of Shirley to SPEC-AGRo in (11a) and movement of Ralph to SPEC-AGRo in (12a) are driven by the need to check the Case features of the moved elements in accordance
with Greed. Runner claims that the suggested derivation of an ECM construction by raising the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo is consistent with Greed.

His second argument concerns the following example:

(13) *I believe very strongly Tony to be honest. (p. 98)
If Tony has raised overtly to SPEC-AGRo, Runner argues, the derivation of example (13) requires the adjunction of the adverb to AGRoP as shown in (14):

(14) \[AGRoP I_i [TP T [FP [F believe F] [AGRoP very strongly [AGRoP Tony_j [VP t_i [V' t_v [AGRoP to be [t_j honest]]]]]]]]

The deviance of (13), therefore, can be accounted for in terms of the restriction that the adverb strongly cannot adjoin to AGRoP.

A third argument comes from the fact that the adverb in (15) can modify the matrix clause:

(15) John expected Nixon, incorrectly, to end the war. (p. 100)
Runner states that as pointed out by Postal (1974), the adverb in (15) can modify either the embedded clause or the matrix clause, giving a reading such as “it was incorrect of Nixon to end the war” or a reading such as “it was incorrect of John to expect Nixon to end the war” (p. 100). When (15) has the second reading, the adverb incorrectly modifies the matrix clause, and hence it has to be in the matrix clause (cf. Radford (1988: 322)). If incorrectly is in the matrix clause, it follows that Nixon, preceding incorrectly, has to be in the matrix clause. Therefore, Runner continues, it must be the case that “the adverb is ... adjoined on the right to the matrix clause,” and that “the ECM subject Nixon is also part of the matrix clause” (p. 100). This fact follows straightforwardly in the OR analysis, Runner maintains, although it remains unexplained in the NR analysis.

A fourth argument is concerned with quantifier floating. Let us consider example (16a) and the relevant part of its structure in (16b):

(16) a. John expects the boys all probably to have left. (p. 119)
Given Sportiche's (1988) suggestion that the quantifier *all* is "'stranded' behind by the subject on its way to Spec, AGRo's" (Runner (1998: 111)), the position vacated by movement of *the boys* to SPEC-AGRo has *all* left behind. This fact is predicted straightforwardly in the OR analysis, Runner claims, although it remains mysterious in the NR analysis.

The final argument concerns the following examples (from Runner (1998: 123)):

(17)  
  a. i. Mikey made out George to be a liar.  
       ii. Mikey; [[made-out] [AGRoP George] [VP ti tv [AGRsP tj]]]  
  b. i. Mikey made George out to be a liar.  
       ii. Mikey; [[made] [AGRoP George] [VP ti [tv out] [AGRsP tj]]]  

In (17bii), *George* has raised to SPEC-AGRo, and this accounts for the fact that the ECM subject, like regular objects of particle verbs, can appear between the verb and the particle, although in (17a(ii)), the ECM
subject is in SPEC-AGRÓ and "the V+Prt have head-moved together" (p. 123), yielding (17ai). Runner claims that example (17bi) provides a strong piece of evidence for overt raising of the ECM subject to SPEC-AGRÓ.

2.3. The Double Object Construction

Runner suggests that both objects in the double object construction move overtly out of VP for Case-checking, forming a structure like (18):^2

\[(18)\]

\[\text{AGR}_1 \text{P} \]
\[\text{DP}_1 \quad \text{AGR}_1' \]
\[\text{a child} \quad \text{AGR}_1 \quad \text{AGR}_2 \text{P} \]
\[\text{DP}_2 \quad \text{AGR}_2 \text{P} \]
\[\text{DP}_1 \quad D_2' \quad \text{AGR}_2 \quad \text{VP} \]
\[t_1 \quad D_2 \quad \text{NP} \]
\[\text{the} \quad \text{book} \quad (p. 152)\]

Observing that the grammaticality of the following examples indicates that the bracketed strings are constituents, Runner maintains that if the first object raises out of VP, followed by overt raising of the verb to F, the facts in (19) and (20) can be accounted for in the same way as those in (5) and (6), respectively:

\[(19)\] I gave John [the book in the morning] and [the magazine in the evening]. (Coordination) (p. 132)

\[(20)\] I have given John and Sam has given Bill [a pewter mug for Christmas]. (Right Node Raising) (ibid.)

Furthermore, observing that the grammaticality of (21) and (22) indicates that the bracketed strings are constituents, Runner argues that if both objects of the double object construction raise overtly out of VP,

^2 This structure is a revision of Johnson's (1991), suggested by Runner.
the facts in (21) and (22) can be accounted for in the same way as those in (5) and (6), respectively:

(21) I sent Tom a letter [at home this morning] and [at his office this afternoon]. (Coordination) (p. 133)

(22) I've sent Tom a letter and John has sent Bill a telegram [from home in the morning]. (Right Node Raising) (p. 134)

Similarly, given that the second object (as well as the first object) raises overtly out of VP, he argues, the deviance of (23) can be accounted for in the same way as the deviance of (7b):

(23) *Cindy showed the boys quietly her book. (Adverb Placement) (p. 136)

3. Problems

In this section, I would like to point out a number of problems with Runner's arguments.

3.1. EPP-Features of Infinitival Clauses

As mentioned above, Runner argues that "movement to the matrix Spec, AGRo for the subject of a passive or unaccusative in an ECM infinitive is exactly analogous to movement to Spec, AGRs for the same type of subject but in a finite clause" (p. 97), as shown in (11) and (12), repeated as (24) and (25), respectively:

(24) a. (=11a)) Laverne believes [AGRoP Shirleyi [AGRsP to have been arrested [VP tv t1]]]
b. (=11b)) [AGRsP Shirleyi has been arrested [VP tv t1]]

(25) a. (=12a)) Richie expects [AGRoP Ralphi [AGRsP to arrive [VP tv t1]]]
b. (=12b)) [AGRsP Ralphi arrived [VP tv t1]]

Movement of Shirley to SPEC-AGRs in (24b) and movement of Ralph to SPEC-AGRs in (25b) are driven by the need to check the Case features of the moved elements in accordance with Greed. Similarly, movement of Laverne to SPEC-AGRo in (24a) and movement of Ralph to SPEC-AGRo in (25a) are driven by the need to check the Case features of the moved elements in accordance with Greed. Runner claims that the derivation of an ECM construction by raising the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo is consistent with Greed. This leads him to conclude that there is no "halfway" movement, and that the ECM subject moves directly to SPEC-AGRo for Case-checking in
accordance with Greed. His argument, however, is not unproblematic. If Shirley raises to SPEC-AGR₀ skipping SPEC-AGRs as in (24a), the EPP-feature in the infinitival clause remains unchecked, which causes the derivation to crash (Chomsky (1995)). The same holds for movement of Ralph to SPEC-AGR₀ in (25a).

One might wonder whether the infinitival clauses in (24a) and (25a) have to have EPP-features or not. If they need not have EPP-features, the above critique does not hold. To clarify the point, let us consider the following examples:

(26) a. *We expect to be someone in the room.
   (adapted from Lasnik (1992: 384))
   b. We expect someone to be in the room.
   (adapted from Lasnik (1992: 384))

Within Chomsky’s (1998, 1999) framework, examples (26a, b) are assigned a structure like (27):

(27) \[ C \[ we [v*P v*-expect [TP to be someone in the room]]]]\]

According to Chomsky (1998: 23), “[t]he EPP-feature of T might be universal,” whereas Chomsky (1999: 6) suggests that “T_{def} cannot have an EPP-feature.”\(^3\) In (27), Agree holds of (v*, someone), valuing and deleting the \(\phi\)-set of v* and the Case feature of someone. If, therefore, infinitival T lacks an EPP-feature, the derivation wrongly converges, yielding (26a). Furthermore, if infinitival T in (27) lacks an EPP-feature, someone cannot raise to SPEC-T (Chomsky (1999)), and example (26b) cannot be generated. If, on the other hand, infinitival T has an EPP-feature as assumed by Chomsky (1998), someone in (27) raises to SPEC-T, yielding (26b), thereby blocking (26a). To permit the derivation of (26b) from (27) while still blocking the derivation of (26a) from (27), therefore, it is necessary to assume, following Chomsky (1998), that infinitival T in (27) has an EPP-feature (see Bošković (1997) for arguments for the EPP-feature of T).

The preceding discussion indicates that infinitival clauses have to

\(^3\) However, Chomsky (1999: 20) states that “(38iv) \[=(ia)\] is the unproblematic result of successive-cyclic A-movement with the intermediate stage (39) \[=(ib)\]”:

(i) a. Many fish are expected to be caught.
   b. are expected \[TP many fish to be caught\]

It should be noted the raising of many fish to SPEC-T in (ib) requires that infinitival T have an EPP-feature (Chomsky (1999)).
have EPP-features. Then it follows that Runner’s derivation of an ECM construction by raising the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo is untenable, since the EPP-feature of the infinitival clause remains unchecked, which causes the derivation to crash.

To avoid this undesirable result, Shirley in (24a) and Ralph in (25a) have to raise to SPEC-AGR first and then to SPEC-AGRo, as shown in the following:

(28) a. Laverne believes \[ \text{AGRo} \text{P Shirley} \text{i} \text{AGRsP } t_i \text{ to have been arrested } \text{VP } t_v \text{ ti]} \]

b. Richie expects \[ \text{AGRo} \text{P Ralph} \text{i} \text{AGRsP } t_i \text{ to arrive } \text{VP } t_v \text{ ti]} \]

It is important to note that although movement of the ECM subject to SPEC-AGR in (28a, b) violates Greed, as noted by Runner, this operation is necessary for the convergence of the derivation. To permit the derivation of an ECM construction, therefore, Greed has to be revised in such a way as to permit movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T. This issue will be discussed later in section 4.2.

To summarize, we have seen that Runner’s derivation of an ECM construction by raising the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo is untenable because that operation leaves the EPP-feature in the infinitival clause unchecked. Since the derivation of an ECM construction requires movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T, Greed has to be revised so as to permit that operation.

3.2. Subject Expressions

Radford (1988: 319) observes that there are “a class of expressions which have the curious property that they are restricted to occurring as the Subjects of Clauses,” which are referred to as Subject Expressions. They include subject idiom chunks such as those in (29) and expletives it and there in (30) and (31), respectively:

(29) a. The chips are down. (p. 319)
   b. The cat is out of the bag. (ibid.)
   c. The shit hit the fan. (ibid.)
   d. The fur will fly. (ibid.)

(30) a. It is raining. (ibid.)
   b. It is a long way to Dallas. (ibid.)
   c. It’s time to leave. (ibid.)
d. *It* is obvious that you’re right.  

(31) a. *There* must have been some mistake.  

b. *There* was considerable dissent among the peasants.  

(adapted from Radford (1988: 320))

Radford notes that subject expressions can occur in the ECM construction as shown by the grammaticality of the following examples:

(32) a. I believe [the chips to be down].  
b. I’ve never known [the fur to fly so quickly].  
c. They reported [the cat to be out of the bag].  
d. I consider [the shit to have hit the fan].  

(33) a. I believe [it to be unlikely that he’ll come].  
b. I’ve never known [it to snow in summer].  
c. They reported [it to be likely that he’d resign].  
d. I consider [it to be time to leave].  

(34) a. I believe [there to be no alternative].  
b. I’ve never known [there to be such poverty].  
c. They reported [there to be considerable dissent among the peasants].  
d. I consider [there to be no good reason not to].  

In Runner’s OR analysis, examples (32a), (33a), and (34a) are assigned structures such as (35a), (36a), and (37a), respectively, under the assumption that expletives it and there are merged in SPEC-AGRs (Chomsky (1993, 1994)), whereas in the NR analysis, they are assigned structures like (35b), (36b), and (37b):

(35) a. I_i believe [AGRoP the chips_j [VP t_i [V' tv [AGRsP t_j to ... t_j ...]]]]  
b. I_i believe [TP the chips_j to ... t_j ...]  

(36) a. I_i believe [AGRoP it_j [VP t_i [V' tv [AGRsP t_j to be unlikely ...]]]]  
b. I_i believe [TP it to be unlikely ...]  

(37) a. I_i believe [AGRoP there_j [VP t_i [V' tv [AGRsP t_j to ...]]]]  
b. I_i believe [TP there to ...]  

In (35a), the ECM subject has to move to SPEC-AGRs first and then to SPEC-AGRo, as noted in the preceding section. The derivation in (35a) renders it impossible to preserve the generalization that the chips of the idiom “the chips be down” is restricted to surface subject position, whereas the derivation in (35b) permits us to preserve the generalization. Similar remarks hold for the subject idiom chunks in (32b–d). Turning next to the derivation in (36a), we see that it is im-
possible to preserve the generalization that expletive *it* with (*be*) *unlike-
ly* as its predicate appears in surface subject position, whereas the der-
ivation in (36b) is consistent with this generalization. Similarly, the
derivation in (37a) renders it impossible to preserve the generalization
that expletive *there* is restricted to SPEC-T, as noted by Chomsky
(1995), whereas the derivation in (37b) is consistent with the gener-
alization. This is quite damaging, since expletive *there* can occur only
in subject position of clauses containing T, excluding small clauses lack-
ing T (cf. fn. 6). As noted by Radford (1988), examples (32)–(34) pro-
vide “strong empirical support for our claim that the italicised NP is the
Subject of the bracketed Complement Clause, not the Object of the
main Clause” (p. 320).

3.3. Adverb Placement

As mentioned above, Runner argues that the OR analysis can

4 One might object that this argument is not very strong, since expletive *it* can
appear in object position as in (i), as noted by Postal and Pullum (1988):

(i) a. We demand *it* of our employees that they wear a tie. (p. 643)
    b. I blame *it* on you that we can’t go. (ibid.)

However, it should be noted that expletive *it* with (*be*) *unlike-
ly*, *snow*, or (*be*) *time* as its predicate as in (33a–d) can appear only in surface subject position.

5 Runner himself notes that expletive *there* cannot appear in SPEC-AGR0, pro-
viding the following example:

(i) *I saw *there* a man. (p. 204)

However, referring to the requirement that AGR0 be filled at PF, he presents the
following example, stating that examples like (ii) “might be what we are looking
for” (p. 236, note 32):

(ii) *I believe *there* to be a riot. (p. 236, note 32)

His statement implies that *there* in (ii) is assumed to be in SPEC-AGR0.

6 Chomsky states this generalization as in (i):

(i) Exp can only be in [Spec, T]. (Chomsky (1995: 362))

“Exp” in (i) has to be taken to refer to expletive *there* but not expletive *it*. Explet-
itive *it* can occur in object position (as noted by Postal and Pullum (1988)) and in
subject position of a small clause lacking T as in (ii) (as noted by Radford (1988)),
although expletive *there* cannot appear in subject position of a small clause as shown
by the deviance of (iii) (as observed by Lasnik (1992)):

(ii) a. *I consider *it* time to leave. (Radford (1988: 325))
    b. *I believe *it* inevitable that war will break out. (ibid.)

(iii) a. *We expect *there* a man in the room.

(adapted from Lasnik (1992: 384))

b. *I want *there* someone here at 6:00. (Lasnik (1992: 384))
account for the deviance of example (13), repeated as (38), in terms of the restriction that the adverb strongly cannot adjoin to AGRoP:

\[(38)\] *I believe very strongly Tony to be honest.\]

However, the OR analysis fails to account for the contrast in grammaticality in (39) (from Radford (1988: 321)).

\[(39)\] a. John persuaded Mary firmly [PRO to resign].
   b. *John believed [Mary firmly to be innocent].

In Runner's analysis, examples (39a, b) are assigned structures like (40a, b):

\[(40)\] a. Johni persuaded [AGRsP Maryj [VP firmly [VP ti [v' [v' tv ti] [PRO to resign]]]]]
   b. Johni believed [AGRoP Maryj [VP firmly [VP ti [v' tv [tj to be [tj innocent]]]]]]

There is no crucial difference between (40a) and (40b): in both structures, firmly is adjoined to VP. This leaves us with no plausible account of the deviance of (39b), as opposed to the grammaticality of (39a). In the NR analysis, on the other hand, Mary remains within the infinitival clause and hence firmly, following Mary, is also within the infinitival clause as in (39b). This enables us to account for the deviance of this example in terms of the restriction that "an Adjunct must be contained within the same S as the V it modifies" (Radford (1988: 322)). The contrast between (39a) and (39b) provides a piece of evidence that the ECM subject remains within the infinitival clause, as noted by Radford (1988).

As seen in section 2.2, Runner argues that the fact that incorrectly in (15) (repeated as (41)) can modify the matrix clause indicates that it is in the matrix clause, and that the ECM subject is also in the matrix clause:

\[(41)\] John expected Nixon, incorrectly, to end the war.

His argument is based on the assumption that if incorrectly modifies the matrix clause, it has to be in the matrix clause (cf. Radford (1988: 322)). If incorrectly is in the matrix clause, it follows that Nixon, preceding incorrectly, has to be in the matrix clause.

---

7 As pointed out by Radford (1988: 321), the contrast in grammaticality in (39) is noted by Chomsky (1981: 100).
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In this connection, it should be mentioned that Chomsky (1995: 331) presents the following examples:

(42) a. John made a decision (last night, suddenly) to leave town.
    b. John felt an obligation (last night, suddenly) to leave town.

Chomsky observes that although “the adverbial may have matrix scope” (p. 331), “overt raising to a higher position is hardly likely” (p. 333) in (42a, b).

Furthermore, Chomsky states that “[a] plausible conclusion seems to me that the scope of the embedded element is narrow, as in (148) [= (43)] and (149) [= (44)], and that (150) [= (45)] involves the kind of ‘rearrangement’ that has been called ‘extraposition’ in the past” (p. 333):

(43) a. I would prefer for my students every year to (get their papers in on time, work hard).
    b. I believe my students every year to (work hard, have gotten their papers in on time).

(44) a. I hear [him often talk to his friends].
    b. I’ve proved [him repeatedly a liar].

(45) I’ve proved [him repeatedly to be a liar]. (p. 333)

According to Chomsky, “[t]he wide scope interpretation may then fall together with such cases as ... (144) [= (42)] ... , in which overt raising to a higher position is hardly likely” (p. 333). This means that the fact that incorrectly in (41) can modify the main clause does not necessarily constitute evidence that the ECM subject has overtly raised out of the infinitival clause.

3.4. Floating Emphatic Reflexives

Radford (1988: 322) states that floating emphatic reflexives require clausemate antecedents in subject position, as shown by the contrast in grammaticality between (46a) and (46b): 8

(46) a. John persuaded Mary himself [PRO to resign]. (p. 322)
    b. *John believed [Mary himself to be innocent]. (ibid.)

In (46a), himself has a clausemate antecedent in subject position in

---

accordance with the above requirement, whereas in (46b), himself, being in the infinitival clause, lacks a clausemate antecedent, violating the requirement; hence the contrast in grammaticality between (46a) and (46b). It should be noted that Runner's analysis of the ECM construction permits the derivation of a structure such as (47):

\((47)\) John\(_i\) believed \([\text{AGRoP Mary}_j [\text{VP himself} [\text{VP ti tv [AGRoP ti to be [ti innocent]]}]])\]

Since himself, adjoined to VP, has a clausemate antecedent in subject position in accordance with the requirement, (47) is wrongly predicted to be grammatical, and one is left with no plausible account of the deviance of (46b). The contrast in (46) constitutes another piece of evidence that the ECM subject remains within the infinitival clause.

4. Theoretical Consequences

The preceding discussion indicates that the OR analysis is useful in accounting for a wide range of data, including those concerning the constituent structure of VP ((5), (6), (19)-(22)), adverb placement ((7b), (13), (23)), floating quantifiers ((16a)), and the complex verb make out ((17b)) which are left unexplained in the NR analysis, but that there are still a number of facts which constitute evidence against the OR analysis, such as those regarding subject expressions ((32)-(34)), adverb placement ((39)), and floating emphatic reflexives ((46)). It might be difficult, therefore, to determine which of the two analyses should be preferred over the other on purely empirical grounds. In this section, I would like to consider some theoretical consequences of the assumption (1) for the minimalist program with respect to an economy principle, the Minimal Structure Principle, and Greed.

4.1. An Economy Principle and the Minimal Structure Principle

In this section, I would like to show that the OR analysis is incompatible with an economy principle suggested by Chomsky (1995: 294), and that the NR analysis is favored over the OR analysis by the Minimal Structure Principle (Bošković (1996, 1997)). Let us start by considering how example (2) (repeated as (48)) is derived within Chomsky's (1999) framework:

\((48)(=\text{(2)})\) John plays tennis.

A structure such as (49) is constructed at some stage of the derivation of this example:
(49)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{John} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{v*P} \\
\text{v*} \\
\text{plays} \\
\text{t_v} \\
\text{tennis} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Agree holds of (v*, tennis), valuing and deleting the \( \phi \)-set of v* and the Case feature of tennis. Merger of John to SPEC-v* and its raising to SPEC-T form (50):

(50) (= (4))

The [v* plays] complex has to adjoin overtly to F to derive the surface order Verb-Object, and other relevant operations form (51):

(51)

If, on the other hand, one adopts the OR analysis, it is necessary to assume that v* is assigned an EPP-feature. Agree holds of (v*, tennis), valuing and deleting the \( \phi \)-set of v* and the Case feature of tennis, and tennis raises to SPEC-v*, deleting the EPP-feature of v*. The [v* plays] complex has to adjoin overtly to F to derive the surface order Verb-Object, and other relevant operations form (51):
Both (50) and (51) yield the same example in (48). We cannot compare the derivation of (48) from (50) with the derivation of this example from (51), since their numerations are different with respect to the presence vs. absence of the EPP-feature of v*. The important point to note here is that assignment of an EPP-feature to v* has no effect on output: both (50) and (51) yield the same example in (48). Therefore, assignment of an EPP-feature to v* violates the economy principle in (52):

\[(52) \quad \alpha \text{ enters the numeration only if it has an effect on output.}\]

(Chomsky (1995: 294))

If v* cannot be assigned an EPP-feature because of this principle, tennis cannot raise to SPEC-v* and hence (51) is not generated. This means that the OR analysis is not compatible with the economy principle (52).

Suppose one assigns an EPP-feature to v*, violating the principle (52) and attempts to derive (48) from structure (51). We see that structure (51) has a functional category F and its maximal projection FP which are lacking in structure (50). The important point to note is that structure (50) is favored over structure (51) by Bošković’s Minimal Structure Principle (MSP) in (53) (adapted from Law (1991: 282)):

\[(53) \quad \text{Provided that lexical requirements of relevant elements are satisfied, if two representations have the same lexical structure, and serve the same function, then the representation that has fewer projections is to be chosen as the syntactic representation serving that function.}\]

(Bošković (1996: 290–291))

To sum up, we have seen that the OR analysis is incompatible with the economy principle (52). Furthermore, even if one sticks to the
OR analysis, and attempts to derive example (48) from (51), violating the principle, the OR analysis involves a structure containing a functional category and its maximal projection which are lacking in the corresponding structure involved in the NR analysis. The MSP, therefore, favors the NR analysis over the OR analysis.

4.2. Greed

As mentioned in sections 2.2 and 3.1, Runner’s analysis of an ECM construction involves raising the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo for Case-checking in accordance with Greed, as in (24a) and (25a) (repeated as (54a) and (54b), respectively):

\[(54)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{(=}(24a)\text{)} \text{ Laverne believes } [\text{AGRoP Shirleyi to have been arrested } [\text{VP tv ti}]] \\
\text{b. } & \text{(=}(25a)\text{)} \text{ Richie expects } [\text{AGRoP Ralphi to arrive } [\text{VP tv ti}]]
\end{align*}
\]

Runner points out that the NR analysis is inconsistent with Greed since it involves raising the ECM subject to SPEC-AGRs in violation of Greed as in (55a, b):

\[(55)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Laverne believes } [\text{AGRsP Shirleyi to have been arrested } [\text{VP tv ti}]] \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Richie expects } [\text{AGRsP Ralphi to arrive } [\text{VP tv ti}]]
\end{align*}
\]

Although Runner does not “claim to assume Greed as a principle of grammar” (p. 97), his argument implies that the OR analysis should be preferred over the NR analysis, since the former, unlike the latter, is consistent with the principle.

As pointed out in section 3.1, however, movement of the ECM subject to SPEC-AGRs, which violates Greed, is necessary to delete the EPP-feature in the infinitival clause. Contrary to what is claimed by Runner, therefore, Shirley in (54a) and Ralph in (54b) have to raise to SPEC-AGRs first and then to SPEC-AGRo even in the OR analysis:

\[(56)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{(=}(28a)\text{)} \text{ Laverne believes } [\text{AGRoP Shirleyi } [\text{AGRsP ti to have been arrested } [\text{VP tv ti}]]] \\
\text{b. } & \text{(=}(28b)\text{)} \text{ Richie expects } [\text{AGRoP Ralphi } [\text{AGRsP ti to arrive } [\text{VP tv ti}]]]
\end{align*}
\]

This means that the derivation of an ECM construction requires move-
ment of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T, regardless of whether one adopts the OR analysis or the NR analysis. Then it follows that Greed in (9) has to be revised so as to permit movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T, as noted by Lasnik (1995a, b, c).\footnote{The following discussion in this section is largely based on Iwakura (1999).} In fact, Lasnik suggests that Greed should be weakened to Enlightened Self-Interest as stated in (57):

(57) Enlightened Self-Interest

Items move either to satisfy their own requirements or those of the position they move to. (Lasnik (1995a: 615))

This principle permits movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T in the derivation of an ECM construction and movement of John in (58a) and we in (58b) from $t_1$ to $t_2$ and from $t_2$ to $t_3$ in the derivation of the following raising constructions, as noted by Lasnik:

(58) a. John is believed [[$t_3$ to be likely [[$t_2$ to be arrested $t_1$]]]]

(Lasnik (1995b: 11))

b. We are likely [[$t_3$ to be asked [[$t_2$ to [[$t_1$ build airplanes]]]]]

(Chomsky (1995: 283))

However, the important point to note is that if Greed is replaced by Enlightened Self-Interest, one can no longer rule out deviant examples like (59a–c) (in which BELIEVE is identical to believe except that it lacks a Case-assigning property), as noted by Bošković (1997):

(59) a. *I have BELIEVED/conjectured [[$_{\beta}$ John to seem [[$_{\alpha}$ t [t likes Mary]]]].

(Bošković (1997: 81))

b. *[[$_{\beta}$ John to seem [[$_{\alpha}$ t [t likes Mary]]]]] is believed t.

(Bošković (1997: 82))

c. *John has BELIEVED/conjectured [[$_{\beta}$ PRO to be illegal [[$_{\alpha}$ t to [t park there]]]].

(Bošković (1997: 81))

In (59a), John is Case-checked in SPEC-$\alpha$, and hence its movement to SPEC-$\beta$ is blocked by Greed, but not by Enlightened Self-Interest. Similar remarks hold for (59b). With respect to (59c), Bošković (1996, 1997) suggests a new analysis of control infinitivals, following the assumption that PRO is assigned null Case (Chomsky and Lasnik (1993)), and the assumption that T of a control infinitival has a feature which checks null Case (Martin (1992)). Given this analysis, PRO is Case-checked in SPEC-$\alpha$ in (59c), and hence its movement to SPEC-$\beta$
is blocked by Greed, but not by Enlightened Self-Interest.

In addition to Enlightened Self-Interest, Lasnik (1995b) suggests the following principle:

(60) An NP (or its set of formal features) is no longer available for ‘A-movement’ when its Case has been checked off.

(p. 29)

It should be noted that this principle can block deviant examples like (59a–c).

Lasnik (1995b) notes that principle (60) requires an assumption such as (61) to permit the derivation of expletive constructions like (62) under the assumption that the Case of a man is checked by is (Belletti (1988)):

(61) The Case of the associate of there has semantic import and hence is not checked-off even if it has participated in checking. (Lasnik (1995b: 17))

(62) There is a man here. (ibid.)

Chomsky (1998) suggests the principle of Suicidal Greed as stated in (63):

(63) Suicidal Greed
Agreement (hence movement) is driven by uninterpretable features of the probe. (p. 42)

Although Suicidal Greed, like Enlightened Self-Interest, permits movement to SPEC of infinitival T in the derivation of ECM constructions and raising constructions like (58a, b), this principle fails to block deviant examples like (59a–c). However, Chomsky (1998) suggests the following principle, assuming that “uninterpretable features render the goal active”:

(64) The operations Agree and Move require a goal that is both local and active. (p. 38)

Suicidal Greed in conjunction with this principle blocks the derivation of examples like (59a–c) while still permitting movement to SPEC of infinitival T in the derivation of ECM constructions and raising constructions like (58a, b).

The preceding discussion indicates that to account for the relevant range of data, Lasnik’s theory requires Enlightened Self-Interest, the principle (60), and the assumption (61), and that Chomsky’s theory requires Suicidal Greed and the principle (64). It is important to note here that the generalization regarding (55a, b), (58a, b), and (59a–c) can be captured in terms of the principle (64). This principle permits
movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T in (55a, b) and movement of John in (58a) and we in (58b) from t₁ to t₂ and from t₂ to t₁ (since the moved elements with Case features are active) while still blocking (59a–c) (since the moved elements with their Case features deleted are inactive).

To summarize, the derivation of an ECM construction requires moving the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival T in violation of Greed, regardless of whether one adopts the OR analysis or the NR analysis. I have shown that Greed should be replaced by Suicidal Greed and the principle (64) to permit movement to SPEC of infinitival T in the derivation of ECM constructions and raising constructions like (58a, b) while still blocking deviant examples like (59a–c).

5. Conclusion

The dissertation under review is one of the studies which have attempted to defend and justify overt raising of direct objects in English to a Case-checking position by showing that the OR analysis is useful in accounting for a wide range of data, including those concerning the constituent structure of VP ((5), (6), (19)–(22)), adverb placement ((7b), (13), (23)), floating quantifiers ((16a)), and the complex verb make out ((17b)) which remain unexplained in the NR analysis. In this review article, I have shown that in spite of the usefulness of the OR analysis, there are still a number of facts which constitute evidence against the OR analysis, such as those regarding subject expressions ((32)–(34)), adverb placement ((39)), and floating emphatic reflexives ((46)).

Furthermore, I have demonstrated that the OR analysis has theoretical consequences for the minimalist program with respect to the economy principle (52), the Minimal Structure Principle (MSP), and Greed. It has been shown that the OR analysis is incompatible with the economy principle (52). Furthermore, the OR analysis involves a structure containing a functional category and its maximal projection which are lacking in the corresponding structure involved in the NR analysis. The MSP, therefore, favors the NR analysis over the OR analysis.

With respect to Greed, Runner suggests the derivation of an ECM construction by moving the ECM subject directly to SPEC-AGRo, claiming that this derivation is consistent with Greed. I have shown that his claim is untenable, and that the derivation of an ECM con-
struc-

tion requires movement of the ECM subject to SPEC of infinitival

T, regardless of whether one adopts the OR analysis or the NR analy-

sis. I have shown that Greed should be replaced by Suicidal Greed

and the principle (64) to permit movement to SPEC of infinitival T in

the derivation of ECM constructions and raising constructions like (58a,

b) while still blocking deviant examples like (59a–c).

In conclusion, it is difficult to say that the dissertation under review

has succeeded in establishing that direct objects in English raise overtly

to a Case-checking position. Much more future research is required to

settle the issue satisfactorily.
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