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1. Introduction

Studies in generative grammar have traditionally recognized basically two types of syntactic dependency in phrase structure: a movement type and a non-movement one. Wh-movement and NP-movement belong to the former, and Binding and Control to the latter, for example. Hornstein (1999), and Boeckx and Hornstein (2003, 2004) challenge the latter assumption by proposing a novel theory of Control, by which phenomena formerly analyzed in terms of Control are treated as cases of movement. Thus instead of postulating PRO in [Spec, TP] of the embedded clause in an example like (1a), they assume that John, generated in [Spec, vP] of the subordinate clause, is raised to the matrix [Spec, TP], passing through the embedded [Spec, TP], as illustrated in (1b).

\begin{align*}
(1) \quad &a. \quad \text{John[i wants [PRO[i to } t_i \text{ win the game].} \\
&b. \quad \text{John[i wants } [t'_i \to t_i \text{ win the game].}
\end{align*}

The alleged movement can be regarded as a case of overt A-movement in that a DP is raised to [Spec, TP] with phonetic effects. They assert that this approach to Control phenomena has a conceptual advantage.
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over the traditional one, since it can eliminate the Control theory from syntax entirely, whereby a simpler model of grammar emerges.\(^1\)

The purpose of this note is to test the validity of this movement analysis of Control in terms of the CSC (Coordinate Structure Constraint). After establishing that only overt movement operations are subject to the CSC, and that as such A-movement also observes it, the note examines whether the CSC effects show up in Control structures. The negative result is obtained, implying that the movement analysis of Control is not tenable as it stands.

2. The Coordinate Structure Constraint

The CSC, dating back to the influential work by Ross (1967), is supposed to restrict movement operations. It is, therefore, not surprising that Variable Binding, which is usually explained with no recourse to movement, does not show the effects of the CSC:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(2)} & \quad \text{a. Every boy} & \text{loves [his mother] and [Ichiro].} \\
& \text{b. Every girl} & \text{loves [George Washington] and [her father].}
\end{align*}
\]

In each example in (2), a bound variable is asymmetrically contained in one of the conjuncts with no degradation of grammaticality. The same point can be made on the basis of Reciprocal Binding:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(3)} & \quad \text{a. They} & \text{criticized each other and [left the conference room].} \\
& \text{b. They} & \text{took part in the meeting and [severely criticized each other].}
\end{align*}
\]

One of the conjuncts in each example in (3) asymmetrically contains a reciprocal expression bound by the subject, but no effect of the CSC is detected. The observed data clearly indicate that non-movement operations are not subject to the CSC.

Notice also that only overt operations are restricted by the CSC. It is well known that Wh-movement in English, which usually applies in overt syntax, observes the CSC:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} & \quad \text{a. *What did you [eat t] and [drink beer]?} \\
& \quad \text{b. *What did you [eat fish] and [drink t]?}
\end{align*}
\]

*Wh*-phrases can stay in-situ in certain linguistic circumstances like echo-

\(^1\) For theoretical details, see Hornstein (1999).
questions:
(5)  a. Pardon? Jeff ate what?
    b. Pardon? George watched what?
In-situ *wh*-phrases of this kind, however, can comfortably be included in one of the conjuncts:
(6)  a. [You cooked the pie] and [Jeff ate what]?
    b. [Jeff read magazines] and [George watched what]?
Thus we see that only overt Wh-movement is sensitive to the CSC.

Scrambling in Japanese exhibits comparable effects. It is impossible to scramble a *wh*-phrase contained in one of the conjuncts in a non-Across-the-Board way, yet no serious degradation of grammaticality is caused when the *wh*-phrase remains in-situ:
     ‘Lit. What did John drink beer and eat t?’
     eat -Past-Q
     ‘John drank beer and ate what?’
Thus, it is safe to assume that only overt operations observe the CSC.

3. A-movement and the Coordinate Structure Constraint

It has been noticed, since Williams (1977), that a passive predicate and an active one can be conjoined:
(8)  John [[[was registered *t* by the police] and *[told his story]]].
If only the (left) passive conjunct involved a trace of *John*, as shown, then (8) would become a clear case of a CSC violation. The grammaticality of the example might be construed as indicating that A-movement is not restricted by the CSC after all. Yet, with the advent of the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis, the problem posed by examples like (8) is solved by postulating a trace within the verbal projection in the right conjunct (Burton and Grimshaw (1992) and McNally (1992)):
(9)  John [[[was registered *t* by the police] and [t told his story]]].
In (9) both of the conjuncts contain traces of *John*, and the example ceases to be an exception to the CSC.
The same reasoning is extended to a case like (10), which was pointed out to me by an *EL* reviewer.

(10) He [[never seems *t* to be angry], and [is kind no matter how cruel someone is to him]].

In (10) the raising predicate *never seems to be angry* and the copula predicate *is kind (no matter how cruel someone is to him)* are conjoined to share the matrix subject *he*. Apparently only the left conjunct contains a trace of *he* in violation of the CSC. Note, however, that a copula predicate like the one in the right conjunct in (10) can also be viewed as a raising predicate. Under this approach, the representation in (10) is revised to (11), where the right conjunct, as well as the left one, comprises a trace of *he*, observing the CSC, as required.

(11) He [[never seems *t* to be angry], and [is *t* kind no matter how cruel someone is to him]].

The claim that raising is involved in a copula sentence is confirmed by examples of quantifier floating discussed in Haegeman and Guéron (1999: 288):

(12) a. The students were [all *t* sick].
    b. All the students were [*t* sick].

In sentence (12a) the quantifier *all*, which is supposed to modify the subject phrase, is found in a position following the copula, suggesting that the subject originates from a position within the predicate, as indicated.

The discussion thus far has established that the CSC is a condition on overt movement operations, and that A-movement is also subject to it. Based upon these, we can make a prediction about the movement analysis of Control: If overt A-movement is responsible for the Control phenomena, then they should exhibit the effects of the CSC. The prediction is, however, not fulfilled:\textsuperscript{2,3}

(13) a. I\textsubscript{i} want [PRO\textsubscript{i} to win the game] and [Jeff to lose the title].
    b. I\textsubscript{i} want [Jeff to work hard] and [PRO\textsubscript{i} to take a rest].

\textsuperscript{2} I omit irrelevant traces of PRO in vP in the representations in (13).

\textsuperscript{3} Licensing of Accusative on the overt embedded subject in each example in (13) is necessarily carried out in a non-Across-the-Board format, since only one of the conjuncts includes it. The implication is that at least overt A-movement is not responsible for licensing of Accusative in examples like these.
In each example in (13), PRO is contained in one of the conjuncts, controlled by the matrix subject. If movement took place from the position indicated by PRO to the matrix [Spec, TP], then the effects of the CSC should be manifested, which is simply not the case. The structural configuration in which the (matrix) subjects and the dependent elements appear in the examples in (13) is analogous to those of Variable Binding in (2) and Reciprocal Binding in (3), suggesting that the Control Phenomena should be grouped into the non-movement type of dependency. While the presented data are not sufficient to refute the movement analysis of Control conclusively, it is obvious that further refinements or modifications of it are needed.4
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4 See Culicover and Jackendoff (2001) and Landau (2003) for arguments against the movement analysis of Control from different perspectives.