If we assume that "PRO subjects originate (and remain) in spec-VP"(155) (see Baltin 1995,p.244 for details) , as shown 7(iii), then "there is no (overt or covert) category intervening between *want* and *to.*" (155) ; accordingly, we can account for the fact that *to* can cliticize onto *want,* as shown in 7(ii). This analysis requires that we assume that the null case carried by PRO " is checked from outside its containing VP by infinitival *to*, in much the same way as in exceptional case-marking structures like *We expect **him** to resign,* the case of ***him*** is checked from outside its containing phrase by the verb *expect.*" (156)

Further evidence for positing that moved subjects leave behind traces in spec-VP comes from the syntax of reflexives, which "generally require a local c-commanding antecedent within the phrase containing them." (156) For example, in (8) (i) the subject originates in spec-VP as the subject of *defeated* ,and is then raised into IP ,where it becomes the subject of *has* -leaving a trace t behind in the spec-VP position which it vacates, as shown in (8) (ii).

(8) (i) John has certainly defeated *himself /* themselves* this time.

(ii) [$_{IP}$ John [$_{I}$ has [$_{VP}$ $_{t}$ certainly defeated *himself /* themselves*

this time

Following Chomsky (1995) that " a trace is a *silent* copy of the relevant moved constituent , it follows that traces will have the same syntactic and semantic properties as their antecedents , and will differ from their antecedents only in that they have no overt phonetic form". (157) It ,accordingly , follows that the trace in (ii)