Proper Government Revisited Howard Lasnik, University of Connecticut June, 1989

- (1) John is likely $[\underline{t}$ to park his car here]
- (2) *John is illegal [\underline{t} to park his car here]
- (3) ...likely [s...
- (4) ...illegal [_S,...
- (5)a Who do you think [[Susan met \underline{t}]] b Who do you think [that [Susam met \underline{t}]]
- (6)a Who do you think [$[\underline{t} \text{ likes Susan}]$ b *Who do you think [that $[\underline{t} \text{ likes Susan}]$]
- (7) ??[What_i [do you wonder [who_j [\underline{t}_j wrote \underline{t}_i]]]
- (8) *[How_i [do you wonder [who_j [\underline{t}_j wrote the book \underline{t}_i]]]
- (9) A trace must be 'properly governed', by means of 'lexical government' or 'antecedent government'. Lexical government requires theta-marking or Case-marking; antencedent government requires binding within a certain local domain.
- (10) [Who [do you think [that [John said [\underline{t} [\underline{t} likes Susan]]]]]
- (11) $??[Who [do you wonder [whether [John said [<math>\underline{t}$ [\underline{t} likes Susan]]]]]
- (12) *Who do you wonder whether likes Susan
- (13) *Who left why
- (14) $*[_{COMP} \text{ why}_{j} \text{ [who}_{i}]]_{i} [_{S} \underline{t}_{i} \text{ left } \underline{t}_{j}]$
- (15) *Who said Bill left why
- (16 *[$_{COMP}$ why $_{j}$ [who $_{i}$]] $_{i}$ [$_{S}$ \underline{t}_{i} said [$_{S}$, \underline{t}_{j} [$_{S}$ Bill left \underline{t}_{j}]]]
- (17) [How [do you think [\underline{t} [John said [\underline{t} [Mary wrote the book \underline{t}]]]]]
- (18) *[How [do you wonder [whether [John said [\underline{t} [Mary wrote the book \underline{t}]]]]]
- (19) This book, I like
- (20) $\begin{bmatrix} S & \text{this book } S & \text{I like } \underline{t} \end{bmatrix}$

- (21) This linguist, I think (*that) solved the problem
- (22) *[S this linguist [S I think [S, that [S \pm solved the problem]]]]
- (23) *[S this linguist [S I think [S, that [S \pm [S \pm solved the problem]]]]
- (24) Only an χ^0 can serve as a proper governor. Thus, a maximal projection in adjoined position cannot.
- (25) $[_{S} \text{ this linguist } [_{S} \underline{t} \text{ solved the problem}]]$
- (26) *John thinks that Mary likes himself
- (27) John thinks that himself, Mary likes
- (28) John thinks $[\varsigma, that [\varsigma himself [\varsigma Mary likes <math>\underline{t}]]]$
- (29) *John thinks that himself likes Mary
- (30) *John thinks [S, that [S, himself likes Mary]]
- (31) *John thinks [$_{S}$, that [$_{S}$ himself [$_{S}$ \underline{t} likes Mary]]]
- (32) I gave to Harry all of my books about universal grammar
- (33) *Solved the problem all of my first year students
- (34) * $[S[S_{tudents}]]$ solved the problem] [NP] all of my first year
- (35) I believe $\begin{bmatrix} S & \underline{t} \\ S & \underline{t} \end{bmatrix}$ to have solved the problem $\begin{bmatrix} S & \underline{t} \\ S & \underline{t} \end{bmatrix}$ all of my first year students $\begin{bmatrix} S & \underline{t} \\ S & \underline{t} \end{bmatrix}$
- (36) George is likely to win
- (37) George, INFL, is likely $[\underline{t}, to win]$
- (38) I consider George to be likely to win
- (39) I consider [S George INFL to be likely [S \underline{t}_i to win]]
- (40) the destruction of the city
- (41) the city's destruction \underline{t}
- (42) the belief [that [John is intelligent]]
- (43) *John's belief [t to be intelligent]
- (44) I consider George likely to win
- (45) I consider [George, INFL, likely [t, to win]]