Government
(Thanks to Željko Bošković for much help with this HO)

Government/barriers have been argued to be involved in at least the following:

A.  θ-role assignment
B.  Case assignment
C.  Conditions A and B of the Binding Theory
D.  Distribution of PRO (which, in the theory under discussion, follows from Conditions A and B)
E.  Locality restrictions on movement and licensing of traces (ECP)
F.  Distribution of null heads

Core X-bar theoretic configurations seem to suffice for θ-theory: A head can only θ-mark its complement and its specifier.

For Case theory, again, core X-bar theoretic configurations seem to suffice. For example, a transitive verb assigns accusative Case to its complement; finite Inf (i.e., Agr-Tense amalgam) assigns nominative Case to its Spec. The only exception appears to be Exceptional Case-Marking, where a V assigns accusative Case to the Spec of its complement. However, essentially following Postal (1974), Lasnik and Saito (1991) show that Exceptional Case-Marking also takes place in a core X-bar theoretic configuration, namely Spec-Head agreement, following A-movement of the ECM subject into the Spec position of an Agr head in the higher clause. Case assignment to an object might also be instantiated in this configuration. [More recently, though, evidence has emerged that this raising is optional, so we still might need Case assignment 'under government'.]

Binding Theory: Governing Category. The Governing Category for α is the minimal XP containing α, a governor of α, and a SUBJECT accessible to α.


Condition B: Do we need the notion of governing category to describe the distribution of pronouns? Would it be enough to just say that pronouns do not tolerate clause-mate antecedents?
(1) *Johni likes himi
(2) *Johni believes himi to be crazy
(3) Johni believes that hei is crazy

PRO: Under the null Case approach to the distribution of PRO (see Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Martin 1996, Bošković 1995, 1997, Ormazabal 1996), there is no need to appeal to government to account for the distribution of PRO (see also Hornstein 1999 for an alternative approach, which also does not need government.)
(4) a. *John believes PRO
   b. *PRO left
   c. John tried [CP [IP PRO to leave]]
   d. *John believed [IP PRO to know French]
[(4d) is good in Romance. See Bošković 1995, 1997 for a null Case account of such constructions in Romance.]
Chomsky and Lasnik (1993): PRO bears null Case, which is checked by nonfinite INFL
(5) *John wanted PRO to seem to t that....

Distribution of null heads (especially null C):
Stowell (1981): null C must be properly governed
Pesetsky (1992): Null C is an affix which must undergo head-movement to V. The movement is subject to usual locality restrictions.

Movement: The hope is that all ECP and subjacency effects with movement and trace-licensing will follow from Economy. One of the most detailed economy accounts of these phenomena can be found in Takahashi (1994). Takahashi argue that only the Subject Condition and relativized minimality type islands like the wh-island need to be accounted for in the syntax. Takahashi provides an economy account of these based on Move. In a pure 'Attract' system, we can account for some relativized minimality type islands, but Takahashi’s account of the Subject Condition is lost (see, however, Ochi 1998, 1999).
(6) ??That book, you wonder why John bought
Chomsky (1999, 2000)
(7) Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2000:108)
In a phase α with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside α, only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.
(phases are CPs and vPs)
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