(1) Which book that John read did he like
(2) *He liked every book that John read
(3) *I don’t remember who thinks that he read which book that John likes
(4) John said that Bill had seen HIM
(5) John wonders which picture of himself Mary showed to Susan
(6) *John wonders who showed which picture of himself to Susan
(7) There is a man in the room
(8) A man is t in the room
(9) There arrived two knights on each other's horses
(10) Two knights arrived t on each other's horses
(11) I saw two men on each other's birthdays
(12) "Such examples indicate that [overt] movement and movement in the LF-component have quite different effects with respect to the binding theory. This theory applies properly after syntactic movement, but each rule of the LF component converts S-structures to which the binding theory applies correctly to LF-representation to which it applies incorrectly."[Chomsky (1981, p.197)]
(13) Some linguists seem to each other [I to have been given good job offers]
(14) *There seem to each other [I to have been some linguists given good job offers]
(15) a Some defendant has to his lawyer to have been at the scene
    b *There seems to his lawyer to have been some defendant at the scene
(16) A man is likely to be here
(17) There is likely to be a man here
(18) Many linguistics students aren't here
(19) There aren't many linguistics students here
(20) The associate of there always displays 'low' behavior, while an overtly moved NP displays 'high' behavior.
(21) a There is/*are a man here
    b There are/*is men here
(22) The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other's trials
(23) *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene] during each other's trials
(24) The ECM subject undergoes raising. The associate of there must then undergo raising of a quite different sort.
(25) The DA proved [no suspect to be at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(26) *The DA proved [there to be no suspect at the scene of the crime] during his trial
(27) The DA proved [noone to be at the scene] during any of the trials
(28) *The DA proved [there to be no one at the scene] during any of the trials
(29) The version of expletive replacement espoused in Chomsky (1991) - adjunction to there, rather than substitution for it - potentially makes the necessary distinction between NPs with high behavior and associates of there. The latter will adjoin to there, hence arguably will not be in the appropriate position to c-command the anaphors, NPs, etc.
(30) There aren't many linguistics students here
(31) Pictures of many students aren't here
(32) Pictures of few students are here
(33) There are few linguistics students here
(34) Many linguistics students aren't here
(35) On May's and Chomsky's theory of adjunction, when $\alpha$ adjoins to $\beta$, $\beta$ becomes a segmented category, and $\alpha$ c-commands anything $\beta$ did prior to the adjunction.
(36) All else equal, movement should never be of an entire syntactic category, but only of its formal features.
(37) Some linguists seem to each other [I to have been given good job offers]
(38) *There seem to each other [I to have been some linguists given good job offers]
(39) a No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [I to have been formulated]
    b Some defendant seems to his lawyer [I to have been at the scene]
(40a) *There seem to any philosophers [t to have been no good linguistic theories formulated]
  b *There seems to his, lawyer [t to have been some defendant, at the scene]

(41) On this kind of account, the elements of the theory of anaphora are not merely formal features.

(42) "...the features adjoined to AgrO...have A-position properties, c-commanding and binding in the standard way." [Chomsky (1995, p. 272)]

(43) Thus, for all purposes (except scope), feature movement is claimed to have the same consequences as NP movement.

(44a) 1\_{AN} AN [FF {linguists} [a]]
  b 1\_{AN} AN [FF {two men} [B]]

(45) "On reasonable assumptions, neither of these structures qualifies as a legitimate binding-theoretic configuration, with AN taking FF {linguists} as its antecedent." [Chomsky (1995, pp. 275-76)]

(46a) 1\_{AN} AN [FF {two men [B]}]  
  b 1\_{AN} AN [FF {two men [AN [a]]}]

(47) The accusative NP overtly raises to Spec of AgrO (with V raising to a still higher head position). The licensing is at LF, but as if at S-structure, since the only relevant movement is overt. Covert movement, involving merely formal features, is incapable of creating new licensing configurations for anaphora etc.

(48) There arrived three men (last night) without [PRO] identifying themselves

(49) Jan oswiadal Marii o swoim ojcusc John telling Mary about self's father  
  (John was telling Mary about his/\*her father)

(50) Jan kazał Marii [PRO\_o, napisać artykuł] John told Mary write article  
  (John told Mary to write an article)

(51) Three men arrived (last night) without PRO identifying themselves

(52) Without PRO identifying themselves, three men arrived

(53) *Without identifying themselves, there arrived three men

(54) Someone seems to be available without PRO seeming to be eager to get the job

(55) *There seems to be someone available without PRO seeming to be eager to get the job

(56) The news upset John while reading the paper

(57) Sono entrati tre uomini senza identificarsi

(58) *Il est entré trois hommes sans s'annoncer
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