(1) John saw Mary

(2)

(3) John believes Mary to be intelligent

(3')

(4)

(5) The DA proved [the defendants to be guilty] during each other's trials

(6) The DA accused the defendants during each other's trials

(7) The DA proved [that the defendants were guilty] during each other's trials

(8) No one saw anything

(9) Anyone saw nothing

(10) The DA accused none of the defendants during any of the trials

(11) The DA proved [none of the defendants to be guilty] during any of the trials

(12) The DA proved [that none of the defendants were guilty] during any of the trials

(13) Hei thinks Bobi is a genius

(14) Condition C: An R-expression must be (A-)free.

(15) Joan believes [he is a genius] even more fervently than Bobi does

(16) Joan believes [him to be a genius] even more fervently than Bobi does

(17) They injured themselves
I asked them 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 pronoun must be free in its governing category.

The governing category for \( \alpha \) is the minimal XP containing \( \alpha \), a governor of \( \alpha \), and ...  

*John believes himself to be clever

John himself believes [ himself 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?

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?

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

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

John is believed [ to be noisy]

*John is preferred [ to be noisy]

John is likely [ to be noisy]

*John is illegal [ to be noisy]

John is believed [ IP to be noisy]

*John is preferred [CP [IP to to be noisy]]

[ CP Who will [IP you see to]]

*John seems [ is crazy]

*John seems to [ that Mary is crazy]

cf. It seems to John that Mary is crazy

*John strikes [ that Mary is crazy]

cf. It strikes John that Mary is crazy

*He strikes that Mary is crazy

*I believe [ him to seem [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 seem to John 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

...and [fix the car], he tried [PRO to]

*...and [know the answer], I believe [ Bill to]

*...and [know the answer], I want [ Bill to]

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
(61) John is likely to solve the problem, and Mary is likely to also
(62) John is likely to be courageous, and Mary is likely to also
(63) John said he was likely to solve the problem, and he is likely to
(64) John said there was likely to be a solution, and there is likely to
(65) How likely to solve the problem is John
(66) How likely to be a solution is there
(67) I tried very hard [PRO to leave]
(68) John told Mary [PRO to leave]
(69) John told Mary about herself;
(70) John told Mary [PRO to leave]
(71) John told Mary about himself;
(72) Jan opowiada Marii o swoim ojcu (John was telling Mary about his father)
(73) Jan opowiada Marii o swoim ojcu (John was telling Mary about her father)
(74) Jan kazal Marii [PRO/PRO napisać artykuły] (John told Mary write an article)
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