go, the [SNom] specifier-feature of *has*, and the [+n]] complement-feature of *has),* "the resulting LF-representation violates the requirement (termed the **principle of full interpretation by Chomsky)** that LF-representations should contain only semantically interpretable features, and the corresponding sentence **Them has go* is ungrammatical." (A. Radford ,1997:74) Note that these features are uninterpretable because they are contradictory. In general," checking results in the (partial) LF-representation". (A. Radford ,1997:73) It is a "partial because we are concerned here only with grammatical features, and so do not represent purely semantic features)." (A. Radford ,1997:73)

Apart from the restrictions of words on their complements and specifiers, there are other types of restrictions ;i.e. structural "restrictions on the binding of anaphors". (A. Radford ,1997:76) The term (reflexive) anaphor is used to describe words like *himself* ,which "cannot be used to refer directly to an entity in the outside world, rather must be **bound** by and hence take [its] reference from an **antecedent** elsewhere in the same phrase or sentence," (A. Radford ,1997:74) as shown in (i). This may be illustrated by the following sentences:

(13)

(i) *He can feel proud of* ***himself.***

(ii) **She can feel proud of* ***himself.***

(iii) ***Himself*** *help me?! You've got to be kidding!*

Sentence (ii) is ungrammatical because the anaphor is **unbound** (i.e. has no suitable antecedent to bind it). Sentence (iii) is also ungrammatical because "there is no potential antecedent of any kind for the anaphor *himself,* with the result that the anaphor is again unbound (and the sentence ungrammatical)." (A. Radford ,1997:74)