

Operators and Variables in Syntax

Masaharu Shimada

In this talk, I presented an analysis of the obligatory presence of that in that-relatives in the cases where the subject is relativized.

(1) the man \*(that) kicked Mary

I claimed that that occurred for grammatical reasons, not for perceptual reasons. Consider the following Norwegian example pointed out by Taraldsen (1986).

(2) Vi kjenner hevm \*(som) snakker med Marit.  
We know, who \*(that) is talking with Mary

(2) is an example of indirect questions. It is ungrammatical if som is absent. Even if som is absent, there may not arise a perceptual problem because a wh-phrase is present. Therefore (1) as well as (2) should be accounted for by grammatical devices. I attributed the reason for the presence of that to a licensing condition of a CP and the E(mpty) C(ategory) P(rinciple).

How is a CP licensed? I assumed that it was licensed if a head of a CP was occupied by V, INFL, or the lexical complementizer that. For example, that and V are licensers in (3) and (4), respectively.

(3) I think [ CP [ C' that ] Mary kicked Tom ]].  
(4) [ CP [ C' Is ] Mary pretty ]]?

Furthermore, following Stowell (1982), I assumed that INFL raised to C in LF. Therefore, in a matrix clause in (3), INFL licenses a CP.

From the assumption made above, I claimed that that must be present in that-relatives like (1) because INFL cannot license a CP

for some reason.

Further I assumed that the ECP was also concerned with the reason INFL cannot function as a licenser in (1). I adopted the ECP formulated in Takano (1988).

(5) Empty Category Principle

\* ... t[- $\tau$ ] ...

where t is assigned [+ $\tau$ ] when properly governed,  
and [- $\tau$ ] otherwise.

(6)  $a$  is properly governed iff  $a$  is canonically governed by all categories sharing features (indices) with it.

Assume that feature sharing relevant here involves the antecedent-trace relation and Case-marking. In the case of subject extraction as in (1), the subject is Case-marked by INFL. Therefore INFL must canonically govern the trace left in the subject position not to raise an ECP violation.

Note that INFL must license a CP when that is absent. Thus INFL is a proper governor and a licenser of a CP in (1a) if that is absent. In this case a sentence should be ruled out. Then I proposed a following condition.

(7)  $X^0$  cannot canonically govern a trace and license a CP simultaneously.

That must be present in (1) to license a CP because INFL cannot function as a licenser.