

7 Government and other Developments

in terms of struct. configuration; affects only nouns. **constituent command or c-command** (235ff). Ben's father didn't trust him. Here *him* is not c-commanded by *Ben* but is by Ben's father. Hence only Ben can be an antecedent for the pro.

236 – α (lpha) c-commands β (eta) iff α does not dominate β and every gamma [XP] that dominates α dominates β . This is strict c-command or a version of m-command. Or, Haegeman: the first branching node dominating A also dominates B.

See diag. Ben's father is dominated by DP, but *him* is not. But Ben's father is the whole DP, dom by AGRP, which also dominates *him*.

Note that alpha can c-comm a higher element, if every gamma works. see 237.

Chomsky uses m-command (uses maximal projection). see diagram 238.

Ben doesn't trust him. Subj c-commands the obj. Hence pro can't take this as its antecedent, according to binding theory.

Government is a version of c-command. Limit at the top (can't go beyond max pro that contains the element) and at the bottom. Head can't govern far into the complement.

240 – **alpha governs beta iff** 1) alpha is a governor (NVPA) and 2) they mutually c-command each other. Meaning they are at the same structural level.

John supposed that Bill would be late: suppose c-commands the CP complement but nothing deeper. The magician threw the knives at his assistant. V governs knives, prep, jassistant, but the nouns don't govern anything as they have no complements.

Government and Case Theory

AGR always assigns case to subj, never obj; V always assigns Case to obj, never subj.

Case Assignment Principle. can only assign Case to a DP that it governs.

see 242. AGR governs subj and TP. only subj will get case. Why isn't the subj marked under VP? Possibly direction of assignment, and see Minimalism too.

ECM's. Non-finite is not a governor, can't assign. Is it the complementizer, eg for, that does it? But the accus subj is in the specifier of the complement. (244) What do we do? If an element governs a category, then it also governs the specifier of that category. Will this work?

*The doctor thinks me is ill. This is ok, since the subj sits in specifier of AGRP inside CP. it can't govern and won't Casemark. So it seems to work. *for* is allowed to do it. What about *no one believed him to be very talented*.

The verb seems to do it; the V can't have a CP *believe for him. Maybe they aren't CP's, but TP's. If it is in the spec of TP, then the V can govern it. Certain verbs, then, select a *for* a TP complement. So in **ECM Structures** the verb will indeed be a governor. **Control Structures**. Big PRO. I want to go. I want Sally to go. Here, No AGR system, so gets its case from outside the TP, as *to* is not a governor. But in I want to go there is a TP but no subj. An invisible subject. The subj I is not in a position to be theta-marked, it is in another clause. No raising here. There is an indep subj, co-indexed with higher subj, empty category PRO.

248 – can appear only in subj position of nonfinite. not obj., not subj of finite. **PRO is ungoverned**. And, it is banned from subj position of nonfinite when the government is from outside, giving confirmation of its reality. *I believe PRO to be intelligent. gov't helps to account for the restrictions on PRO.

What do we do about I want Sally to leave, looks like an ECM. But I want to leave...suggests it is not ECM.

Make the infinitive a CP and an *-e-* that will assign case to the subj (!!!) – 249

I want [CP *e* prepositional (which assigns case to the subject) [AGRP Sally to leave]] [cf. Russian *xochu, chtoby*, French *je veux que + subj*].

can't be present when PRO is there. Cf. Russ and Fr. infinitive, like English.

Binding Theory 250

Pronom may not have a c-commanding antec. in same clause, while anaphors must have one. John likes him ~ John likes himself.

Names can't have c-commanding antecedents anywhere: *He_i thinks Bill likes John_i. (But cf. When he thinks he's right, John is unflappable — n c-command here.

Cf. (2) on anaphors as bound in local domain, *pro*'s are free in local, r-expressions are free. 'free' means 'not bound'.

Binding is c-command and co-indexing. **Alpha binds beta iff 1) a c-commands beta and 2) they are co-indexed.**

251 - John believes himself to be the winner. John considers him to be the best.

both are subj of infinitive; they are Case-marked from outside clause. The reason why the clause is not the local domain is that the clause doesn't contain the governor.

Local domain: the minimal governing category of alpha, where category is a maximal projection containing both a subj [= a clause] and a lexical cat. governing alpha [containing alpha].

So binding governs the co-reference properties of elements. John likes himself: the reflexive is c-commanded by and co-indexed with the subj (hence bound). Its governor is AGR and its governing category is the matrix clause, the one containing the governor.

(252) *John-i believes him-i to be intelligent. Pronominal here bound by the subject of the matrix clause. It must however be free in its governing category. It is the subject of an exceptional clause, so its governor is the matrix verb and so its governing category is the matrix clause. As the pronoun is bound in its governing category the sentence is ungrammatical.

j

Binding Theory and Empty Categories 252

Anaphor and movement. John was admired t is like the anaphora clause John admired himself. Two positions related by movement and by anaphor. But not over a clause boundary:

*John was thought Mary admires t

*John thinks Mary admires himself.

Exception is the DP in nonfinite clause. John was thought (t) to like Mary, John considered himself intelligent.

Why?

The trace of a moved DP always has an antecedent, the DP itself, like anaphora. Maybe DP-traces are anaphors, must be bound in a local domain.

have to bind its own trace.

Traces of wh- movement are like r-expressions. The **strong crossover effect**, where it is impossible to move a wh- over the top of an antecedent:

*who-i did he-i say Mary likes t-i

This is ok if it is not bound by he. Has to be free from everything, like r-expr.

wh- trace has to be free from everything. Like an r-exp, except that it is bound by the wh-element itself. Always in an A-bar position. Both r-exp and wh- are A-free, that is, free of all elements in a-positions.

little pro is just like a pronominal and can be exchanged for one.

The empty equivalents: DP-trace, wh-trace, pro. But PRO seems to act both like a pronominal and an anaphor.

255 – John wants PRO/himself to win. Exchangeable.

PRO to leave would be a mistake. For one to leave would be a mistake. But anaphors must be bound and pronominals must be free – in their governing category. What if PRO has no such category? Like: you have to wear a hat or may not wear a hat if it is raining – a regulatory contradiction.

As long as it isn't raining, you are ok. *Dogs must be carried on the Underground* (buy a dog).

PRO is ungoverned. It is a pronominal anaphor. Sum-up:

overt	empty	anaphor	pronominal
reflexive pro's	NP-trace	+	-
personal pro's	little pro	-	+
r-expressions	wh-trace	-	-
--	PRO	+	+

Boundedness of Movement and Proper Government

256- Islands of Ross, can't move out of. You can go out of a CP of V:

who-i did Mary think [John saw t-i]

but not out of a rel clause: *who-i did Mary see [the man [who-j t-j knows t-i]]

Movement is to a local position. Allowed in CP if the spec is vacant. You go:

who-i did Mary think [CP t-i [IP John saw t-i]]. But not in the relative clause, where the spec is already filled.

Notion of proper government helps diff between subj and obj position movement.

*who did Mary think that t-i saw Bill

but who did Mary think that Bill saw

Seems in the subj that 'that-trace effect' prevents it. We will examine this more closely.

Bounding

Basic notion is that you are not permitted to move an element too far. **Subjacency**: nodes are hurdles. Only one at a time. Therefore, all are local. But what are these nodes?

Eg. Who did Mary think John saw? Go to the first AGR (see 259), then the second. Spec is empty. *Who did John ask when fixed the car? The spec is filled by another wh- and it can't go. Or: *Who did John wonder what t-i bought? Again, lower spec is filled by what. Subjacency is violated: who-i did [AGRP John wonder [CP what-j [AGRP t-i bought tj]]]

A DP can also be a bounding node.

*Who did John believe the statement that Bill hit?

Who did John believe that Bill hit?

(259)

But subjacency hasn't much to say about head movement. Eg auxiliary up the nodes to Has-i John t-i t-i seen Mary? But over-the-top movement is not allowed, even if one only node:

*Have John will t-i seen Mary? **the Head Movement Constraint**, not explained.

Proper Government

Subj-obj asymmetry. Obj is relatively free, subj can be extracted only when *that* is not present.

Traces in subj position must be licensed in a restricted way; governed by functional heads. **Empty Category Principle**: an empty category must be properly governed: iff alpha governs beta and alpha is lexical.

262 – In subject position you could have a trace properly governed if it is governed by the element it is co-indexed with, Antecedent government. *that* interferes with the government, making the original trace non-proper and in violation of ECP. *that* is a nearer governor and makes it in violation.

Barriers (1986) – very complex. Both subj and ECP restrict movement. There is some redundancy here. Ch tries to unify it under notion *barrier*. What is a barrier? No single node universally so.

Move from a CP is ok: Who do you think that Mary went out with, but not out of adjunct:
*who were you so drunk that Mary went out with? << You were so drunk that Mary went
out with who.

Need a blocking category to show that complements of lexical elements are not barriers,
non-complements are (eg adjuncts). Not every blocking cat is a barrier: Who did Mary
see? Ch thinks IP is the only blocking category that is not a barrier (265).

Or by inheritance. If a cat dominates a blocking category of that element.

Effects: subjects can only be licensed by antecedent government as they are not head-
governed. Subj can only be moved if it doesn't cross a barrier blocking antecedent govt.
267 – Ch thinks it's the C' bar that is a barrier here. **the Minimality Condition:** govt is a
unique relationship and if an element is governed by one thing it will not be governed by
another. An element will minimally govern its trace if there is no other "typical potential
governor" that is closer to the trace. (271)

Tricky!

Summary: anything but IP can be a barrier if not L-marked (given a th-role) and it
dominates the element that the barrier is defined for [eg C' can affect the C *that*].

Relativized Minimality by Rizzi (1990). What counts as a governor is 'relativized' to
what is being governed; no type of govt interferes with any other type.

HMC is like wh- over the top, and super raising: *John seems it to be likely to win.

But heads can be moved over arguments, arguments over heads, wh- over heads and arg.

It is a type-relevance.

Restricted to where the moved head is able to govern its own trace. Eg will be restricted
to the net head position up the tree to prevent antecedent govt. See 269 and 270.

"An element will minimally govern its trace if there is no other 'typical potential
governor' that is closer to the trace." Replaces Barriers complexity. typical: head, or A-
position, or A-bar. So now a wh- item cannot move out of both an IP and a CP in one go,
as it would be moving over the top of a typical potential governor: the spec of IP. **Head**

Movement Constraint

How to deal with *that*-trace stuff, in

*who-i do you think t-i that t-i left

Rizzi assumes both antecedent govt and head govt have to be satisfied. The trace is antecedent governed but not properly licensed, not a L.

Take away the that and spec of CP (trace) and empty head; the empty complementizer is a proper head governor for the original trace and the structure is saved from ECP. This explains super-raising, wh-, islands.

Barrier: a non-L-marked element.