

The ECP
November, 2011


- (1) ECP (Empty Category Principle) 1st version:
A trace must be governed
- (2) *John is illegal [_{CP}[_{IP} *t* to park here]] (CP is a barrier to government; non-finite Infl isn't a governor)
- (3) ECP 2nd version:
A trace must be properly governed (Proper government is government by a **lexical head**)
- (4) *Who do you think [that [*t* solved the problem]] (*t* is not properly governed)
- (5) Which problem do you think [that [John solved *t*]] (*t* is properly governed by solve)
- (6) Who do you think [*t*' [*t* solved the problem]] (*t* is not lexically governed)
- (7) α properly governs β if
 - i. α governs β and α is lexical ('lexical government')
 - ii. α binds β and β is (zero) subjacent to α ('antecedent government' (not really an instance of government))
- (8) *Who do you think [_{CP} *t*' [_C that [_{IP} *t* solved the problem]]]
- (9) Either that somehow blocks antecedent government
or
that somehow turns C' into a barrier for antecedent government
- (10) ?*Which car did you leave [before Mary fixed *t*] Subjacency - an 'adjunct island'
- (11) *How did you leave [before Mary fixed the car *t*] (*t* is not properly governed, so the ex. violates both Subjacency and the ECP)
- (12) Similarly for all islands: extraction of an adjunct in violation of Subjacency always yields crashingly bad results.
- (13) Lasnik and Saito technology: A trace that is properly governed is marked + γ ; one that is not is marked - γ . The ECP says *[- γ]
- (14) ✓ How do you think [*t* [(that) [Mary fixed the car *t*]]] (Why no "that-trace effect with adjuncts?")
- (15) Lasnik and Saito proposal: Adjunct traces are not gamma-marked in overt syntax (maybe because they aren't present yet). In LF (as in overt syntax) that can be deleted.
- (16) Argument traces are gamma-marked in overt syntax (or we lose the that-trace effect for subjects).
- (17) *How₂ do you wonder [when₁ [John said *t*₁ [*t*₂' [Mary solved the problem *t*₂]]]]]

- (18) Intermediate traces must be properly governed. (t_2 is antecedent governed by t_2' ; so it must be the latter the is not properly governed in violation of the ECP.)
- (19) Further, gamma-marking must be specifically at **levels**. If t_2' could properly govern t_2 and then delete, (17) would be a 'mere' Subjacency violation.
- (20) Chomsky's version of this, from the mid-1980's: "Adjuncts must be fully represented". That is, all the traces in the chain of the moved adjunct must remain.

(21) *Who left why

(22) Suppose all WH-phrases move eventually, creating an adjunction structure.

(23) LF:



(24) *Who t_1 said [[John left why]] Again, intermediate traces must be properly governed.

(25) ?*Which car did you leave [before Mary fixed t]

(26) Who left before Mary fixed which car Subjacency doesn't constrain LF movement. (Huang)

(27) ?*What do you believe the claim that Lisi bought t (Subjacency: 'Complex NP constraint'. There is actually a difficult puzzle here, since by the core Barriers theory, there will actually not be any barriers, assuming that a head N θ -governs its clausal complement. We put this problem aside here.)

(28) ✓Ni xiangxin Lisi mai-le sheme de shuofa Chinese
 you believe Lisi buy-Asp what claim

(29) *Why do you believe [the claim [that [Lisi left t]]]

(30) *Ni xiangxin [[Lisi weisheme likai] de shuofa Chinese
 you believe Lisi why leave claim

(31) And similarly for all islands. This is the most powerful argument I know for covert movement.

(32) Mali renwei [[Yuehan weisheme likai]]
 Mary thinks John why leave
 "Why does Mary think [John left t]"

(33) Long distance interpretation (hence movement) of adjuncts is fine when there is no island.