Second, the syntax of reflexive anaphors indicate that there is a *local* antecedent of the reflexive *They want [**John** to help **himself**]/ *They want [**John** to help **themselves**].* The notion of a local antecedent means "an antecedent contained within the same [bracketed] clause as the reflexive". (A.Radford,1997: 84) The latter sentence is ungrammatical because the reflexive *themselves* does not have a local antecedent; i.e. its local antecedent is *John* ,not *they*.

Third, the agreement between the predicate nominals in copular constructions [linking verbs] (i.e. nominals that are predicated to a subject such as *John became a millionaire*) with the subject of their own clause provides further evidence for the presence of PRO, as shown in (2).

2.
(i)They want [**their son** to become *a millionaire]/* millionaires*
(ii) They want [**PRO** to become * *a millionaire]/ millionaires*

The word *a millionaire / millionaires* in these sentences agrees with the subject contained within the same [bracketed] clause, and not with the matrix subject. This is why we posit that there is a **PRO** contained within the same [bracketed] clause with which *a millionaire* agrees. Therefore, we conclude that we have overt subject pronominals and covert subject pronominals in apparently subjectless infinitive complements.

However, there is a Case difference between personal pronouns and PRO. "If we assume that it is the defining characteristic of personal pronouns that they carry Case, PRO too must carry Case. Chomsky and Lasnik (1995,:119-20) suggest that PRO carries **null Case** ,and that its Case is checked by infinitival *to*." (A.Radford,1997: 85) This means that this infinitival *to* carries a null-Case specifier-feature (indicating that it requires a PRO subject);and this specifier-feature is checked against null-Case head-