Case and Government

I. The role of Government in Case theory

(1) $\alpha$ governs $\beta$ if every XP dominating $\alpha$ also dominates $\beta$ and vice versa: XPs are 'barriers' to government.

(2) Case assignment requires government.
(3) a. The object of a transitive verb is Accusative.
    b. The subject of a finite clause is Nominative.

(4) V governs its complement
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(6) 'Infl' governs its Specifier.
(7) He will win
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(9) On the 'split Infl' hypothesis, with Tense and Agreement each heading its own projection:

(10) AgrP
   / \ \
  DP   Agr'
  / \ \
 Agr   TP
  / \ \
 T'   \
  / \ \
 T    VP

II. Questions about Government

(11) The subject of the infinitival complement of certain verbs is Accusative. IP, unlike other XPs, is not a barrier to government. V 'exceptionally' governs into IP:
(12) ... believe her to be a genius
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(14) Configuration of Accusative checking: V-Complement
(15) Configuration of Nominative checking: SPEC-AGR
(16) Configuration of 'Exceptional Case Marking': ???

(17) Suppose we try to unify simple NOM (8) and ACC (5). The
former is a Spec-head configuration, the latter a head-complement one. Government can rather easily be formulated
so as to encompass these two distinct configurations. It can
be made to include ECM (13), but with much more difficulty.

(18) Another 'split' in Infl: In addition to subject agreement
(AGRS), object agreement (AGRO). Then ECM can, via NP
movement, also be assigned in a SPEC of AGR configuration:

(19)
(20) Now Accusative, Nominative, and ECM are all assigned in X'-configurations: Head-Complement for the first; SPEC-head for the others.

(21) But we can do even better: If ECM is SPEC-head, standard Accusative can be as well (and should be, since there is no known morphological or other difference between them).
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\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AGR}_p P \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{AGR}_s' \\
\text{AGR}_s \\
\text{TP} \\
(\text{SPEC}) \\
\text{T}' \\
\text{T} \\
\text{AGR}_o P \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{AGR}_o' \\
\text{AGR}_o \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V}' \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

(23) Now all Case licensing is in the same configuration: Spec-head. But to really make this work, we have to deal with a major problem:

(24) *I Mary believe to be a genius

(25) *We Mary admire

(26) Two possible solutions:
   a. The DP moves, but in LF, so you can't hear the movement (like QR, or WH-movement in Chinese, or V 're-raising').
   [Based on Chomsky (1991)]
   b. The DP moves, and the V moves to a still higher position.
   [Based on Koizumi (1993); Koizumi (1995)]

III. Evidence for Raising

(27)a Joan believes he$_i$ is a genius even more fervently than Bob$_i$ does
   b *Joan believes him$_i$ to be a genius even more fervently than Bob$_i$ does         Postal (1974)
(28)a Joan believes he is a genius even more fervently than Bob's mother does  
   b?*Joan believes him to be a genius even more fervently than Bob's mother does  
   Lasnik and Saito (1991)

(29) The DA questioned two men during each other's trials
(30)a The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other's trials  
   b ?*The DA proved [that two men were at the scene] during each other's trials  
   c *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene] during each other's trials

(31) The DA questioned noone during any of the trials
(32)a The DA proved [noone to have been at the scene] during any of the trials  
   b ?*The DA proved [that noone was at the scene] during any of the trials  
   c *The DA proved [there to have been noone at the scene] during any of the trials

(33) The DA questioned no suspect during his trial
(34)a The DA proved [no suspect to have been at the scene of the crime] during his trial  
   b *The DA proved [that no suspect was at the scene of the crime] during his trial  
   c *The DA proved [there to have been no suspect at the scene of the crime] during his trial

IV. Overt or covert?

(35)a They're trying to throw out the garbage  
   b They're trying to throw the garbage out

(36)a They're trying to make John out to be a liar  
   b(?)They're trying to make out John to be a liar  
   c They're trying to make out that John is a liar  
   Kayne (1985)

(37)a Someone found Germany recently to have been justified in the Lusitania sinking  
   b *Someone found that Germany was recently justified in the Lusitania sinking  
   Postal (1974)  
   c Someone found recently that Germany was justified in the Lusitania sinking

(38)a I've believed John for a long time now to be a liar  
   b I've believed for a long time now that John is a liar  
   Kayne (1985)
(39) Overt raising to Spec of Agr₀ along with overt raising of V to a still higher position. [Following Koizumi’s ‘split VP’ hypothesis.]

(40) Overt raising to Spec of Agr₀ along with overt raising of V to a still higher position. [Following Koizumi’s ‘split VP’ hypothesis.]


