John saw Mary

\[\text{AGRsP} \quad \text{SPEC} \quad \text{AGRs' \quad SPEC} \quad \text{AGrS} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{SPEC} \quad T \quad \text{VP} \quad V' \quad \text{NP} \quad V'' \]
They asked themselves about themselves.

If Case is checked (only) in SPEC-head configurations with appropriate functional heads, what is the role of the notion 'government' in the theory?

A. An anaphor must be bound in its governing category.
B. A pronominal must be free in its governing category.

*John believes himself to be clever
John himself believes [him to be clever]

Might all Condition A effects reduce to constraints on the (LF) movement of an anaphor?

*John believes [him to be clever]

If government is not relevant to the characterization of governing category, what makes the governing category of \text{him} in (28) the matrix clause?

*It was arrested PRO
*I believe [PRO to be clever]

PRO must be the subject of (certain) non-finite clauses.

PRO must be Case-marked (with 'null' Case.)

John is believed [t to be noisy]
*John is preferred [t to be noisy]

*John strikes [that Mary is crazy]
It strikes John that Mary is crazy

*It strikes John that Mary is crazy
It is rare for it to strike John that Mary is crazy

*It is rare for John to strike [that Mary is crazy]
It is rare for it to strike [that Mary is crazy]

*It is rare for John to strike [that Mary is crazy]
It is rare for John to seem to [that Mary is crazy]

*It is rare PRO to strike [that Mary is crazy]

*It is rare PRO to seem to [that Mary is crazy]

*It is rare PRO to seem to [that Mary is crazy]

...and [fix the car], he tried [PRO to t]
...and [know the answer], I believe [Bill to t]
...and [know the answer], I want [Bill to t]

John tried to be courageous, and Mary tried to also
I want John to be courageous, and I want Mary to also
(60) I believe John to be courageous, and I believe Mary to also believe this.

(61) John is believed to be courageous, and Mary is believed to also believe this.

(62) John is likely to be courageous, and Mary is likely to also be courageous.

(63) John said he was likely to solve the problem, and he is likely to have solved it.

(64) John said there was likely to be a solution, and there is likely to be a solution.

(65) How likely is it to solve the problem?

(66) *How likely is there to be a solution?

(67) *[How likely is it to be a solution?] is there

(68) John told Mary that he is likely to leave.

(69) John told Mary about herself.

(70) *John told Mary about herself.

(71) John told Mary about himself.

(72) Jan opowiada Marii o swoim ojcu. (John telling Mary about his father)

(73) *Jan opowiada Marii o swoim ojcu. (John telling Mary about self's father)

(74) Jan kazaMari o swoim ojcu. (John telling Mary about her father)
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