

The layered domains of Binding

Non-complementarity It is well known that in certain configurations, anaphors and pronouns aren't in complementary distribution (e.g., (1)), which is unexpected by the traditional Binding theory. Reinhart and Reuland's (1993) (R&R) predicate-based binding theory (where conditions apply to the relevant predicates, not arguments), explains the non-complementarity as follows. The anaphor in say (1) is exempt since *pictures* isn't a syntactic predicate (as it lacks a subject), and condition A doesn't apply, resulting in exemption for the anaphor.

(1) John saw pictures of himself/him.

However, Postal (2006) shows that English non-locally bound anaphors necessarily have a *de se* reading and hence must be animate. Likewise, Charnavel and Sportiche (2014) (CH&S) show that the divide 'exempt vs. bound' anaphors in French is also drawn by (in)animacy. But, the anaphor in configurations such as (1), it turns out, can be inanimate (non-logophoric) (2a-b), undermining R&R's account. Moreover, alongside inanimacy, additional diagnostics show that the anaphor in (2a-b) isn't logophoric. For instance, it can be bound by a quantified noun phrase (QNP) (3a-b), unlike logophors (Postal 2006), and disallows split antecedents (4a-b) (Lebeaux 1984). Similarly, the animate anaphor in (1) need not be logophoric, as shown by (5), where it's bound by a QNP.

- (2) a. The spaceship receives pictures of itself/it.
b. The law includes constraints on itself/it.
- (3) a. Every/No spaceship receives pictures of itself/it
b. Every/No law includes constraints on itself/it.
- (4) a. *The spaceship automatically transmits to the satellite pictures of themselves.
b. *The law imposes on its derivatives constraints on themselves.
- (5) Everyone/No one saw pictures of himself/him.

For R&R, examples (2-5) may be taken to be problematic as their discussion of the non-complementarity suggests a correlation with the logophoricity of the anaphor. Ch&S, in turn, confine their discussion to anaphors and don't deal with the non-complementarity. Unlike in (1-4), in (6), where there's a potential antecedent in the domain of the predicate (henceforth, the argument domain, where the predicates are associated with their arguments), anaphors and pronouns do show complementarity (6).

- (6) a. John lost [Mary's pictures of *himself/herself.]
b. John lost [Mary's pictures of him/*her.]

This paper develops a binding approach, which among other things accounts for the non-complementarity, taking into account the observation that logophors must be animates. The approach involves three main new ingredients: (i) layered binding phases, (ii) the relevance of coargumenthood, not subjecthood, (iii) the relevance of CP, not finiteness.

The proposal We thus observe two syntactic binding domains (**L**ower and **H**igher), with their corresponding domain-based **binding principles** (**L** and **H**), whose working is explained below.

Principle L (In the argument domain)	Principle H (In the CP-phase)
An anaphor must be bound in the presence of a coargument, and is exempt – otherwise.	An anaphor that is exempt in the argument domain must be bound. A logophor – by a covert logophoric operator (OP _{Log}).
A pronoun must be free.	

The Account Consider principle L. By L, the anaphor in (6a), having a coargument (*Mary's*), must be bound in the argument domain; the pronoun must be free (6b). In contrast, in the argument domain of (1-3), the anaphor is exempt owing to lack of a coargument. The pronoun is (vacuously) free, as expected by L. Notice that unlike previous binding principles, the domain of application of L is defined based on coargumenthood, not necessarily referring to a subject. This explains the contrasts in (7a) and (7b), which can't be accounted for by reference to a subject, as the relevant domain (that of *entrusting*) lacks a subject.

- (7) a. *Everyone/No one {opposed/commented on} the entrusting of Mary to herself/*himself.
 b. John {opposed/commented on} the entrusting of Mary to him/*her.

Next, consider principle H. In the CP-phase of (2-3), the anaphor (exempted in the argument domain by L) is bound by the subject in SpecTP, in concert with H. An animate anaphor may be similarly bound. Or it can be bound by a covert OP_{Log} related to a logophoric center, as suggested by CH&S. This means that animate anaphors seem able to have a non-c-commanding antecedent (8a), an antecedent outside their CP (8b), or lack an antecedent altogether (8c). Inanimate anaphors disallow these, as illustrated by (9).

- (8) a. The picture of himself_i in Newsweek bothered John_i. (Pollard and Sag 1992)
 b. Max boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself for a drink. (R&R)
 c. A picture of myself would be nice on that wall.
 (9) a. *Anonymous posts about itself_i hurt [the camera]_i's sales.
 (adapted from Charnavel and Zlogar 2015)
 b. **The Nature of It All*_i insisted that those ideas had been simultaneously revealed in my article and itself_i. (Postal 2006)

This surface difference between animates and inanimates ((8) vs. (9)) has masked the fact that inanimate anaphors can also be exempt, leading CH&S to argue that exemption equals animacy. But inanimate anaphors can be exempt, as shown by configurations where they aren't in complementary distribution with pronouns. Under our system, any anaphor exempt by L (that is, in the argument domain) is bound in the CP-phase, either by a (regular) antecedent or by OP_{Log} ; anaphors bound by OP_{Log} must be animate.

Finally, the domain of H is defined as the CP-phase, not as the domain of finiteness commonly assumed. If it were the domain of finiteness, one would expect (10a) to be as grammatical as (10b), contrary to fact. ECM predicates analyzed as raising to object predicates (10c) (Postal 1974, among others) and raising predicates (10b) are the only ones allowing an antecedent in the matrix ((10d) being ruled out by principle L).

- (10) a. *Everyone_i argues that I_k promised him_i [PRO_k to like pictures of himself_i]
 b. Everyone_i argues that I_j seem to him_i [t_j to like pictures of himself_i]
 c. Everyone believes himself to be honest.
 d. *Everyone wants Mary to like himself.