More on Movement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of chain in position where Case is assigned</th>
<th>A-movement</th>
<th>A’-movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of chain in position where theta-role is assigned</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot of chain in position where Case is assigned</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>sometimes (if the moved element is an adjunct, there is no Case at the foot of the chain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT OF CHAIN IN POSITION WHERE THETA-ROLE IS ASSIGNED</td>
<td>sometimes (if the moved element is an expletive, there is no theta-role at the foot of the chain)</td>
<td>sometimes (if the moved element is an adjunct, there is no theta-role at the foot of the chain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous differences between A and A’-movement follow from their general properties, which we already know.

There are many other differences between them. Here is one of my favorites.

What does (1) mean?
1. Who thinks that Mary likes him?

and (2):

2. Who$_i$ thinks that Mary likes him$_i$?
3. For which person x: x thinks that Mary likes x
Now look at (4):

4. Who does his mother like?
   (4) is grammatical but it can only have the indexing in (5), not in (6). If the indexing in (6) were possible, (4) would have the meaning in (7,8), which it does not.

5. Who_{i} does his_{k} mother like?
6. *Who_{i} does his_{i} mother like?
7. For which x does x’s mother love x?
8. Who is loved by his own mother?
So the configuration in (9) leads to ungrammaticality:

9.* WH_k .......... [.....pron_k.....]............t_k

[.....pron_k.....] indicates that the pronoun is contained inside a constituent and does not c-command out. That is, the pronoun does not c-command the trace t_k.

A WH-word cannot cross over a coindexed pronoun that does not c-command the trace of the WH-word.
How do we know that movement (i.e. the crossover) is necessary for the violation?

10. Who\textsubscript{i} likes his\textsubscript{i} mother?
11. Who\textsubscript{i} thinks his\textsubscript{i} mother is nice?
4. *Who\textsubscript{i} does his\textsubscript{i} mother like?

no crossover $\rightarrow$ no violation

Weak Cross Over violation (WCO):

12. * WH\textsubscript{k} ........ [.....pron\textsubscript{k}....].............t\textsubscript{k}
If you are wondering why it is called Weak CO: it is in opposition to Strong Cross Over (SCO).

In SCO, unlike in WCO, the pronoun does c-command the trace of movement. Can you think of SCO violating sentences?

13. Who does he like?
14. Who does he think Mary likes?

(13, 14) are fine sentences but only on the indexing in (13’,14’), not the indexing in (13’’, 14’’), which would have led to the unavailable readings in (15,16).

13’. Who does he like?
14’. Who does he think Mary likes?
13”.* Who does he like?
14”. *Who does he think Mary likes?

15a. For which x, x likes x
   b. Who likes himself?

16a. For which x, x thinks that Mary likes x?
   b. Who thinks that Mary likes him?
Strong Cross Over violation:

17. \( \text{Wh}_i \quad \ldots \quad \text{pron}_i \quad \ldots \quad \text{t}_i \)

And again we can check that the crossing over is crucial:

18. \( \text{Who}_i \) believes that Mary likes him\(_i\)?

Can you see what SCO might be reducible to?

Binding Condition C!
So, what we see is that WH-movement (A’-movement) is subject to WCO and SCO.

Is A-movement subject to WCO? What sentences should we create to find out if it is? This will take a bit to set up, so please bear with me.

Remember the general profile of WCO:

19. \( \alpha_i \; [\ldots \text{pron}_i \ldots] \; t_i \)
Remember:
20. It seems that he is the best candidate
21. He seems to be the best candidate

What is the derivational relationship between these two sentences?

21’. He_k seems [ t_k to be the best candidate]

Now look at these:

22. It seems to me that he is the best candidate
   the “experiencer”
23. He seems to me to be the best candidate

24. He_k seems to me [ t_k to be the best candidate]
25. It seems to [his mother] that John is the best candidate.

In (25) the pronoun and John can have different indices, as in (26), or the same index, as in (27):

26. It seems to [his\textsubscript{k} mother] that John\textsubscript{m} is the best candidate.

27. It seems to [his\textsubscript{k} mother] that John\textsubscript{k} is the best candidate.

The indexing in (27) provides us with the right environment to check whether A-movement is sensitive to WCO. We do this by moving John over the co-indexed pronoun, as in (28), which is a fully grammatical sentence:

28. John\textsubscript{k} seems to [his\textsubscript{k} mother] [t\textsubscript{k} to be the best candidate].
So!

A’-movement is subject to WCO violations. A-movement is not!

29. $\alpha_i \ [\text{....pron}_i\text{....}] \ t_i$

- bad if $\alpha_i\ldots t_i$ is an A’-chain
- fine if $\alpha_i\ldots t_i$ is an A-chain
Let’s look at the type of sentences that we created along the way and see if there is something else we want to say about them.

30. It seems to him\(_k\) that he\(_k\) is the best candidate
31. *He\(_k\) seems to him\(_k\) to be the best candidate

What can we conclude?
A-movement “feeds” Binding Theory!
A-movement creates new antecedents for BT.
32. *It seems to herself$_k$ that Mary$_k$ is the best candidate

33. Mary$_k$ seems to herself$_k$ [t$_k$ to be the best candidate]

What about the following pair:

34. It seems to John$_k$’s mother that he$_k$ is the best candidate

35. *He$_k$ seems to John$_k$’s mother to be the best candidate.
So A-movement creates new antecedents for Binding.

Which means that Binding Theory applies (at least also) after A-movement takes place.