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Müller (2017) argues that, whereas Merge builds structure, a mirror-image operation Remove removes structure. This squib provides more evidence for Remove, arguing that it explains an otherwise puzzling nominal-preposing paradigm.

Remove is feature-driven and highly local, being subject to (1):

1. **Strict Cycle Condition (SCC)**
   Within the current XP $\alpha$, a syntactic operation may not exclusively target some item $\delta$ in the domain of another XP $\beta$ if $\beta$ is in the domain of $\alpha$.

A head’s Remove-feature can target a maximal projection ([–$Y_2$–]) or a head ([–$Y_0$–]). In the former case, the entire YP is removed ((3)). In the latter case, the head Y and its “shell” are removed, and its dependents reattached to the main tree ((4)).
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The Remove hypothesis predicts that a head should be able to attract an XP and remove its XP shell. This is correct. When *though* attracts a predicate nominal headed by $a$, the $a$ must disappear for many speakers, myself included (Levine 2001:152; cf. Ross 2000):

5. Though she is a good doctor . . .

6. (**A** good doctor though she is . . .

On the Remove hypothesis, this is straightforward to explain. Assume that $a$, the nominal’s head, is a Numeral (Perlmutter 1970, though cf. Yasui 1975). *Though* optionally (i.e. in (6), but not (5)) bears a Numeral-probe with an EPP-subfeature ([*Nmrl*]$^{EPP}$). In (6), it probes, finds the $a$-nominal (satisfying [*Nmrl*]), and attracts it (satisfying the EPP-subfeature). This version of *though* also bears a Remove-feature [–Nmrl0–], as a lexical idiosyncrasy (on which more below). It therefore removes $a$ (and the NmrlP shell):
This analysis makes several predictions.

First, when the *though* lacking [*Nmrl*]EPP is chosen (so the *a*-nominal does not move), *though* should be unable to remove a long-distance—because Remove obeys the SCC ((1)), preventing long-distance Remove. This is correct:

(8) **Though she is good doctor . . .

Secondly, recall that the cooccurrence of [–Nmrl0–] and [*Nmrl*]EPP on (one version of) *though* is a lexical idiosyncrasy. Nothing in the theory forces the *though*-bearing [*Nmrl*]EPP to also bear [–Nmrl0–]. Therefore, it is possible for there to be grammars in which a version of *though* bears [*Nmrl*]EPP but not [–Nmrl0–], so an *a*-nominal can prepose around *though* and retain its *a*. There are indeed: for Postal (1998:29), (9) is acceptable.

(9) %A good doctor though she was . . .

Thirdly, if indeed the Remove-feature is [–Nmrl0–], it should not remove the (a D). This is correct. For a reviewer, certain the-nominals can prepose around *though*, but the the must remain:

(10) %The best doctor though she might be . . .

Remove, then, makes possible an explanation of the otherwise strange phenomenon of *a*-deletion, its strictly local nature, and the idiolectal variation it displays.
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