Absolute and Relativized Locality in the Binding Theory

1. Introduction *

1.1. In spite of interesting distinct assumptions and conceptual differences, Huang's (1983) & Chomsky's (1986) BT models, which heavily rely on thc non-complementary distribution of pronominals and anaphors (henceforth "PRONOUNs") as NP subjects, are built up in order to derive the following basic, or unmarked, "regularity": when a PRONOUN α is the subject of the minimal X^{max} δ which contains it and its governor, this X^{max} is its Governing Category or GC if α is a pronominal, but if it is an anaphor, its GC will have to be a larger X^{max} —in Huang's terms, because δ does not contain an accessible SUBJECT (the anaphor itself being the SUBJECT of this minimal X^{max}), and in Chomsky's terms, because δ (renamed Complete Functional Complex or CFC) does not contain any potential binder for α which would render their coindexation "BT-compatible" with α's anaphoric nature.[1]

The definition of GCs is therefore doubly "relativized": (i) with respect to the nature — anaphoric or pronominal — of the PRONOUN involved, and (ii) with respect to the specific position it occupies.

1.2. Recall too that a CFC contains a subject "by definition" (Chomsky 1986: 169); hence, the CFC or GC of an anaphor α will necessarily contain a subject β distinct from it: if α is not a subject, the subject β of the minimal CFC which contains α and its governor will be a potential binder for α; but if α itself is a subject, any potential binder will have to belong to a wider CFC, as was said above,

(*) This paper globally deals with the same sort of data as examined in Rebuschi (in press-a, b). However, the solutions it proposes are, for the most part, totally new.

I would like to thank Jacqueline Guéron, Ken Hale, Sarah Konnelly and David Lebeaux on the one hand, and Emile Larre, Beñat Oyharçabal and Xarlex Videgain on the other, for discussing the English and the Basque examples respectively; all errors are nonetheless mine.

(1) Huang's approach, which incorporates the *LGB* concept "accessible SUBJECT", also deals with the ungrammaticality of anaphors as tensed clauses' subjects in a farily straightforward way: Agr/Infl *is* accessible to that subject. As for Chomsky's story, it is much less clear: "To bar an anaphor in this position, then, we would appeal not to binding theory but rather to the principle ECP [...], which excludes the trace of *wh*-movement in this position in such sentences as *'who do you think that *e* saw Bill'. We therefore associate anaphors in the position of subjects of finite clauses not with bound pronouns but rather with variables". (*op. cit.*, 176). See section 3 and the discussion of example (40).

[ASJU Geh 35, 1997, 279-300]
http://www.ehu.es/ojs/index.php/asju

and this wider CFC will in turn possess a subject. Now, according to Huang, again by definition, the GC of an anaphor will contain a SUBJECT accessible to it, hence distinct from, and excluding, it.

Overlooking the empirical differences between these two systems —because they seem irrelevant to the purpose of this paper— we can provisionally conflate the relations just observed by referring to a "distinct* S/subject" to denote either a SUBJECT accessible to α or a subject distinct from it. We are then in a position to crudely define two GCs for α, an *absolute* minimal GC or AMGC, and a *relativized* minimal GC or RGC, independently of α's anaphoric or pronominal nature.

(1) a. The AMGC of a PRONOUN α is the minimal X^{max} which contains α, its governor γ, and a S/subject β.
b. The RGC of a PRONOUN α, is the (possibly wider) minimal X^{max} which contains α, its governor γ, and a distinct* S/subject β.

We can now restate the principles A and B as in (2), and next express a prediction made by these relativistic approaches.

(2) a. An anaphor must be bound in its RGC.
b. A pronominal must be free in its AMGC.

(3) When the AMGC is distinct from the RGC (i.e. when a pronoun is the S/subject of its X^{max}), the former domain is irrelevant for the description of an anaphor's properties; more specifically:
a. an anaphor α is not specified for the +/- value of the features [anaphoric, pronominal] it might have in its AMGC; or:
b. an anaphor α may not be specified as [+anaphoric] in its AMGC.

1.3. In section 2, I will use specific data borrowed mainly from Northern Basque to falsify both the weak version (a) of (3) and its strong version (b). As a consequence, it will appear that, although the identification of a GC admittedly depends on the specific position a PRONOUN (more specifically an anaphor) occupies, the other tenet of the relativistic approach, namely that the definition of a GC also depends on the nature —anaphoric or pronominal— of the PRONOUN involved, cannot be maintained: the original idea, which dates back to the late 70's and *LGB*, that anaphors and pronominals are basically in complementary distribution, should probably be sustained.

In section 3, I will propose a new definition of the binding domains "AMGC" an "RGC" which should account for the relevant facts as well as for better known ones. The basic idea will be to conceptually unify the two ideas that a GC (i) must contain a PRONOUN's governor, and (ii) must also correspond to a θ-domain; the notion "Lexical Governor" will serve the purpose.

Finally, in section 4, I will show that my proposals help solve a long-standing problem in Basque syntax, viz. the fact that the "reflexive" genitive *bere* can, even

in those dialects in which it is submitted to a locality constraint, and contrary to the reflexive possessives of Indo-European languages, specify the subject NP and take one of the object NPs as its antecedent.

2. Basque Reciflexives

2.1. A first look at the "reflexive genitive" *bere*

Northern Basque has two distinct unemphatic 3rd person genitives. One, *bere*, is traditionally known as a "reflexive possessive", and is furthermore inherently genitive. The other one is *haren*, the genitive of the deictic pronoun *hura*; it must be referentially distinct from all the arguments which can bind *bere*. (There is also an emphatic genitive *beraren*, which, although etymologically related to *bere*, has all the properties of the pronominal *haren*, cf.(4b) and (5b)). The fact that for all practical purposes, *bere* apparently is a standard anaphor (an analysis which will be drastically modified in section 4) is illustrated below: (4) and (5) show that it must be coindexed with either the subject, or the direct or indirect object; in (6), where *beren* is the form *bere* takes when its antecedent is plural, a typical property of anaphors is illustrated: it cannot have split antecedents; finally, (7) shows that *bere* must be "locally" bound.

(4) a. Peiok Mayi bere amari erakutsi dio
Peio-E Mayi-A *bere* mother-D shown AUX [2]
'Peio$_i$ has shown Mayi$_j$ to his$_{i/*k}$/her$_{j/*k}$ mother'
b. Peiok Mayi haren / beraren amari erakutsi dio
haren *beraren*
'Peio$_i$ has shown Mayi$_j$ to his $_{*i/k}$/her$_{*j/k}$ mother'

(5) a. Peio Mayiri bere amaz mintzatu zaio
P.-A Mayi-D *bere* mother-INS spoken AUX
'Peio$_i$ has talked to Mayi$_j$ about his$_{i/k}$/her$_{j/*k}$ mother
b. Peio Mayiri haren / beraren amaz mintzatu zaio
haren / beraren
'Peio$_i$ has talked to Mayi$_j$ about his$_{*i/k}$/her$_{*j/k}$ mother'
c. Peio Mayiz bere amari mintzatu zaio
P.-A Mayi-INS *bere* mother-D spoken AUX
'Peio$_i$ has talked to his$_{i/*j/*k}$/*her$_{[*j/*k]}$ mother about Mayi$_j$

(6) a. Peiok Mayi Ø/*beren amari erakutsi dio
Peio-E Mayi-A *beren* mother-D shown AUX
'Peio$_i$ has shown Mayi$_j$ to their$_{i+j}$ mother'

(2) Beside the usual abbreviations, such as GC, etc., the following less conventional ones will be used: A: absolutive; AN: adnominalizing suffix; AUX: auxiliary; E: ergative; G: genitive; INS: instrumental.

b. Peio Mayiri Ø/* beren amaz mintzatu zaio
P.-A Mayi-D *beren* mother-INS spoken AUX
Peio$_i$ has talked to Mayi$_j$ about their$_{i+j}$ mother'

(7) a. Haren / *bere laguna joan da
haren *bere* friend gone AUX
'His/her friend has gone'
b. Peiok erran du [haren / *bere laguna joan dela]
P.-E said AUX *haren* *bere* friend gone AUX+COMP
Peio$_i$ has said that his$_{i/j}$ friend has gone'

According to the theories under discussion, *bere(n)*, which is the S/subject of the minimal X^{max} which contains it, is correctly bound in its RGC. However, this does not tell us anything about its properties within its AMGC: they may of course only be discovered in a context where the GCs are identical, i.e. when *bere* is *not* a S/subject. Such a context is provided by the *-t(z)e*-nominalizations, which allow a direct object to be in the genitive, cf. (8a):

(8) a. Peiok Mireni [PRO Jonen ikusteko] erran zion
Peio-E Miren-D Jon-G to-see said AUX
'Peio told Miren to see Jon'
b. Peiok$_i$ Mireni$_j$ [PRO$_j$ *bere/ haren$_{i/*j/k}$ ikusteko] erran zion
Peio-E Miren-D *bere haren* to see said AUX
'Peio told Miren to see him'

In such embedded non finite clauses, the PRO is at the same time a subject and a SUBJECT; what is more, in (8b), it is both distinct from *bere* and accessible to it. *Bere* should therefore be bound to it — at least if it had no specific property related to its narrow domain AMGC. In other words, if the binding theory has nothing to say about the behaviour of an anaphor like *bere* in its AMGC, the ungrammaticality of *bere* in (8b) cannot be explained away in non ad hoc terms. But suppose that *bere* is lexically specified as follows:

(9) The Basque anaphor *bere* must be free in its AMGC as well as bound in RGC.

Obviously, it could not simultaneously satisfy this double requirement when the two domains happen to coincide — being governed, it cannot escape the paradox as PRO does. Consequently, the ungrammaticality of *bere* in (8b) is to be expected under this assumption. On the other hand, the possible coindexation of *haren* with the subject of the matrix clause follows if we admit (10):

(10) The Basque pronominal *haren* must be free both in its AMGC *and* in its RGC.[3]

(3) Such "middle-distance" pronominals are also widely attested in Indo-European languages, cf. the pairs *suus* ≈ *eius*, *sin* ≈ *hans* or *svoj* ≈ *jego* in Latin, Danish and Russian respectively.

The freedom of *haren* in its AMGC in (8b) is as predicted by Huang, Chomsky and every other possible formulation of principle B of the Binding Theory; its freedom in its RGC is independently inferred from (4b) and (5b).

2.2. Secondary predications and the two Basque reciprocal expressions

More evidence will be given below concerning (9), as we will see that another Basque anaphor has the same property. But before we do, we must discuss the empirical content of the following generalization:

(11) The S/subject of a secondary predication is relevant for the determination of an anaphor's GC when this anaphor is inside a secondary predicate.

Let us therefore consider the data provided by example (12), which by and of itself raises intriguing theoretical questions, and its two equivalent counterparts in Northern Basque.

(12) They$_i$ saw snakes$_j$ near each other$_{i/j}$

(13) a. Heiek$_i$ sugeak$_j$ elkarren$_{*i/j}$ ondoan ikusi zituzten
they-E snakes-A *elkar*-G by-the-side seen AUX
'They$_i$ saw snakes$_j$ near each other$_{*i/j}$'

b. Heiek$_i$ sugeak$_j$ bat bertzearen$_{i/*j}$ ondoan ikusi zituzten
bat bertzea-G
'They$_i$ saw snakes$_j$ bear each other$_{i/*j}$

The ambiguity of (12) might have at least three causes: (i) *contra* (11), the subject of a secondary predication is invisible for the Binding Theory; (ii) the two distinct interpretations (as they are made explicit by the Basque translations) correspond to two distinct structures; (iii) *each other* is not necessarily locally bound, whether locality is defined in terms of an AMGC or of an RGC.

On the one hand, (iii) is highly dubious, since even in those languages which have long distance anaphors (and English is hardly one such language), reciprocals never seem to be able to be extra-locally bound (see Van Riemsdijk 1985 for instance). On the other hand, the very complementary distribution of the two Basque reciprocal expressions as illustrated in (13 a,b) also renders both hypotheses (i) and (ii) doubtful. *Re* (ii), in particular, it should be obvious that secondary predicates must be regarded as being predicated of either the (root) subject NP or the direct object NP, as (14) shows, where it clearly is only for extra linguistic reasons (our knowledge of the world as it is) that we "naturally" assign the predicates *raw* and *nude* to *the meat* and *John* respectively.

(14) John ate the meat raw/nude

Moreover, note that if the existence of a phrase — a Small Clause — is felt to be necessary in order to account for the fact that *raw* is predicated of *meat*, one would probably also have to assume that another phrase is required to explain that *nude* can be predicated of *John*.[4]

What is more, against (i) but in conformity with (11), the subject of a secondary predication does play a role — at least in some cases — as indicated by (15):

(15) The children$_i$ do not consider those $_j$ [good pictures of them$_i$]$_j$

Yet, many native speakers of English also accept sentences such as the following:

(16) a. The children $_i$ do not consider those $_j$ [good pictures of each other$_i$]$_j$
b. The fathers$_i$ ordered theirs sons$_j$ out of each other$_{i/j}$'s rooms.

We therefore have what looks like a paradox here, since the direct object NP *those* seems to induce a GC for *them*, but not for *each other*. Recall, however, that English *them* must be free in its AMGC, whereas *each other* need only be bound in its RGC. From a purely descriptive point of view, then, the most natural hypothesis is some version of the following principle:

(17) The subject of a secondary predicate induces an AMGC, but is does not induce an RGC.[5]

It is significant that, whatever lies behind (17), we need the same sort of principle to account for the Basque data in (13). First, the reciprocal expression *elkar* in (13a) cannot be bound to the main predication subject *heiek* 'they', but must rather be bound by the secondary predication subject *sugeak* '(the) snakes'; *this anaphor then has to be bound in the narrow domain AMGC*, assumed here to correspond to a conservative VP (i.e. one which does not contain its own subject's trace).

Consider next the other reciprocal expression, *bat bertzea*, of (13b). Just as in the English example, the null hypothesis is that the structure is the same as in (13a); as a consequence, by (1b) and owing to the fact that *sugeak* is a "S/subject", we would expect the VP to also be *bat bertzea's* RGC, and thence predict the ungrammaticality of (13b) with *bat bertzea* carrying the index *i*. But the expectation is not borne out. It follows that both in English and in Basque, (17) holds good.

(4) Safir (1983: 19) has explicitly made such a proposal:
(i) John ate the meat [$_{SC}$ PRO naked] (ii) John ate the meat [$_{SC}$ PRO raw]
However, since no indication is given of the structural position(s) where the Small Clauses may be located, and in the absence of a clear theory of Control, nothing much can be made of such an approach —note particular that if the SC of (ii) may entertain the illusion that binary branching *à la* Kayne is possible, such a constraint seems pretty difficult to implement in the case of (i).

(5) Recall however that Lebeaux (1983) has shown that *each other* and the reflexives *himself*, etc., do not have the same distribution; compare for instance (15) and the following sentence, due to Williams (1989: 68b) —I will return to this question—:
(i) *John$_i$ considers that$_j$ [a picture of himself$_i$]$_j$

2.3. A Typology for reciflexives

Let us underline the following conclusion: just as we saw that *here's* behaviour falsifies (3a), since it has to be free in its AMGC, we must infer from *elkar's* properties that they falsify (3b): here, we have an anaphor which must be bound in its AMGC *even when this domain is smaller than its RGC* —in other words, *elkar* is an anaphor which must be bound in the very domain which, according to Huang and Chomsky, *only* qualifies for pronominals. (Needless to say, this entails an ensuing falsification of principle A as it is formulated in (2a) too).

More generally, and leaving real long distance anaphors aside, we have the following typology for "short- and middle-distance" anaphors:

(18) a. Anaphors which may be bound or free in ther AMGC, but must be bound in their RGC: English *each other.*
b. Anaphors which must both be free in their AMGC and bound in their RGC: Basque *here* (a reflexive) and Basque *bat bertzea* (a reciprocal).
c. Anaphors which must be bound in their AMGC: Basque *elkar.*[6]

Other constructions illustrate these properties. Consider first the possessive use of genitives for example.

(19) [Peio(k) eta Mirenek]$_i$ [bat bertzearen$_i$/ *elkarren liburuak]
P.(-E) and M.-E *bat bertzea*-G *elkar*-G books-A
irakurri dituzte
read AUX
'Peio and Miren have read each other's book's.

Why is *elkar* ungrammatical here? The answer should be obvious: if its binding domain is its AMGC, this domain will be the NP *elkarren liburuak*, since it contains a S/subject, *elkar* itself.[7] Thus, although there is no potential binder for it there, the sentence is out. On the other hand, *bat bertzea* is trivially free in that NP, and correctly bound in its RGC, the entire sentence.

Recall now the argumentation concerning the ungrammaticality of *here* in (8b). If it was on the right track, we can make the prediction that *bat bertzea* will behave in the same manner; and this prediction is borne out, as (20b) illustrates:

(20) a. Guk$_i$ elkar$_i$ ikusi ginuen
we-E *elkar*-A seen AUX
'We saw each other'
b. *Guk bat bertzea ikusi ginuen
bat bertzea-A

(6) It is quite plausible that the English reflexives also belong under (18c): see Lebeaux's (1983) examples, or the contrast between (15) and Williams' sentence quoted in the preceding footnote.

(7) The impossibility for English reflexives to appear in the genitive case would then follow for the same reasons that forbid *elkarren* in (19).

Indeed, I need only repeat here what was said there: since the two GCs coincide, *bat bertzea* cannot satisfy its two distinct properties stated in (18b) simultaneously —hence the ungrammaticality of (20b), as opposed to the grammaticality of (20a).

Let us now introduce the typical argumental anaphor which corresponds to English *himself*; it is *bere burua*, lit. '*bere* head' or 'his own head' or 'his own head' —as (21b) shows, this expression may also have a literal reading.

(21) a. [Peiok$_i$ [bere burua]$_j$ ikusi zuen
Peio-E *bere* head-A seen AUX
'Peio saw himself' [8]
b. Peiok$_i$ [bere$_i$ burua]$_j$ ikusi zuen
'Peio$_i$ saw his$_{i/*j}$ (own) head'

Observe now *bere burua*'s inability to act as a possessive under "normal" circumstances in (22b), or its inability to be bound by the main predication subject in sentences similar to (13) in (23b).

(22) a. [Peiok [bere xakurra] jo du
Peio-E *bere* dog-A beaten AUX
'Peio$_i$ has beaten his$_{i/*j}$ dog
b. *Peiok [bere buruaren xakurra] jo du
bere burua-G

(23) a. Peiok aberastasun handiak [bere baitan] baditu
Peio-E wealth big-PL-A *bere* within he-has-them
'Peio$_i$ has great qualities in him$_{i/*j}$'
b. *Peiok aberastasun handiak [bere buruaren baitan] baditu
bere burua-G

In either case, it is as if the finite verb's subject is too far away from *bere burua* to properly bind it. Given the hypotheses put forth here, a straightforward explanation for such data is possible: it is the direct objet NP itself which is the AMGC of *bere burua* in (22b), and the VP (as the minimal X^{max} which contains a secondary predication, hence a S/subject) in (23b) (I will slightly modify this analysis later on). In conclusion, then, *bere burua* patterns like *elkar*, so that the distributional complementarity already described for *elkar* and *bat bertzea* carries over to the pair *bere* ≈ *bere burua*. Moreover, the properties of *bere burua* corroborate the foregoing empirical falsification of both versions of (3) and of Chomsky's idea that Principle A of the BT only makes sence in a local domain which displays at least a potential binder for an anaphor.

(8) One might wonder whether *bere burua* as a whole and *bere* inside it are simultaneously submitted to the binding principles which constrain them. In fact, there is no problem here, since *bere* is both trivially free within its AMGC — the global expression *bere burua* itself — and bound in its RGC, the next domain up.

3. Absolute and Relativized Locality

3.1. Copular constructions and the *i/i filter

We may now take a closer look at the properties of the two GCs. To begin with, note that, although complementary distribution still obtains, the grammaticality of the reflexive and reciprocal pairs *bere burua* ≈ *bere* and *elkar* ≈ *bere burua* is reversed in such contexts as the following:

(24) a. Iñaki [[bere buruaren] etsaia] da
I.-A *bere burua*-G enemy-A he-is
'Iñaki$_i$ is [his own]$_i$ enemy [9]'

b. Iñaki [*bere etsaia] da

(25) a. Iñakik$_i$ [Jon$_j$ [bere$_{i/*j}$ etsaitzat]] dauka
I.E J.-A *bere* enemy-for he-holds-him
'Iñaki$_i$ considers Jon$_j$ his$_{i/*j/*k}$ enemy'

b. Iñakik$_i$ [Jon$_j$ [[bere buruaren]$_{*i/j}$ etsaitzat]] dauka
I.-E J.-A *bere burua*-G enemy-for he-holds-him
'Iñaki$_i$ considers Jon$_j$ his$_{*i/j/*k}$ (own) enemy'

c. Mutikoek [neskatxak [elkarren lagun hoberenak] dauzkate
boys-E girls-A *elkar*-G friend best-PL they-holds-them
'The boys$_i$ consider the girls$_j$ each other$_{*i/j}$'s best friends'

d. Mutikoek$_j$ [neskatxak$_j$ [bat bertzearen lagun hoberenak]
boys-E girls-A *bat bertzea*-G friend best-PL
dauzkate]
they-hold-them
'The boys$_i$ consider the girls$_j$ each other$_{i/*j}$'s best friends'

Consider the contrast between (22) and (24) for instance. We have already seen that the domain in which *bere burua* must be bound is its AMGC — the one which corresponds to (English-like) pronominals. How is it possible then for the same item to be ungrammatical in (22b), and grammatical in (24a)? Conversely, we have seen that *bere* must be free in its AMGC, *and* bound in its RGC; consequently, our story — or Chomsky's — holds good for (22a), as expected, but, again, fails to account for (24b).

One possible way to handle *bere*'s case would be to indirectly follow Chomsky (1981) and Huang (1983) and have recourse to the *i/i filter. Assuming furthermore that a predicative NP is coindexed with the subject — see Williams (1980) — ungrammaticality would ensue in (24b), since coindexing *bere* with the subject would induce an *i/i filter violation, as shown in (26) — but no in (22a), for obvious reasons.

(9) In English, neither *himself's* nor even *his* are acceptable here; so perhaps the sequence "pronominal + *own* must be considered a suppletive form of the latter — cf. Chomsky (1986: 176-177) on *own*, and Williams (1987: 157) for a different approach — which, admittedly, would be more problematic for the suggestion made here that English reflexives and Basque *elkar* or *bere burua* pattern alike.

(26) *(Iñaki$_i$) [bere$_i$ etsaia]$_j$ da

There are, however, several strong objections to this approach.

(i) Its seems strange that other anaphors, such as *bere burua* or *elkar*, should not be submitted to the same constraint: cf. (27a), which corresponds to (24a), and (27b,c), which correspond to the relevant portions of (25b,c).

(27) a. OK (Iñaki$_i$) [[bere buruaren]$_i$ etsaia] da
b. OK (Jon$_i$) [[bere buruaren]$_j$ etsaitzat]$_j$ ...
c. OK (neskatxak$_j$) [elkarren$_j$ lagun hoberenak]$_j$ ...

(ii) More generally, as far as the complex reflexive expression *bere burua* itself is concerned, the *i/i filter must anyhow be deactivated — otherwise, the configuration (28) would be ruled out, and no such expression could ever be used at all, although in many unrelated languages (e.g. Georgian, Hebrew, etc.) it is an expression of the same type which translates *himself*.

(28) OK (Peiok$_i$) [bere$_i$ burua]$_i$ ikusi zuen [see (21a)]

(iii) Example (7b), a simplified version of which is repeated below as (29a), shows that a potential violation of the filter is not in itself a counter-opacity factor allowing a Basque PRONOUN to look for an antecedent farther away if its coindexation with the local subject is not possible: if it were the CASE, the sentence should be grammatical with the subject of the matrix clause binding *bere* (which is correctly free in its AMGC), but it is not. Likewise, sentence (29b) is excluded in the variety of Basque studied here, whatever the index on *bere* may be, although its coindexation with the embedded subject NP is ruled out by the filter, and its coindexation with the matrix subject NP is, on the contrary, licit with respect to that filter.

(29) a. *Peiok erran du [bere laguna joan dela]
P.-E said AUX *bere* friend gone AUX+COMP
'Peio has said that his friend has gone'
b. *Iñakik erran daut [Jon [bere laguna] dela]
I.-E told AUX J.-A. *bere* friend he-is-Comp
'Iñaki has told me that Jon is his friend'

It is therefore clear that the *i/i filter cannot be used here — as one might have expected anyhow, since many of the examples discussed are concerned with the AMGC, not the possibly wider RGC, of the PRONOUNs, and since the filter's essential *syntactic* function is to *enlarge* the grammatical GC of a PRONOUN, cf. *LGB*. It also follows that neither the notion "accessible SUBJECT" (which is directly built on the *i/i filter), nor its twin notion "distinct subject" can be operative for the items that must be bound in ther RGC: (i) what was said above of the *i/i filter and the coindexation with a subject NP as in (29) directly carries over to the co-

rresponding "accessible SUBJECT", with the same empirical consequences. (ii) As for the notion "distinct subject", although it does work for (29b), where the embedded subject NP *Jon* is distinct from (the NP which contains) *bere*, it definitely does *not* in (29a)'s case.

3.2. Towards a definition of the AMGC

3.2.1. Let us accordingly give up accessibility and the *i/i filter, and, in order to account for the facts under discussion, adopt the idea, also due to Williams (1980), that an N has an "external argument" just as a V does, but that this external argument (which is assigned the θ-role *R*) is only realized in the syntax when the NP is predicative: the *R* role is then realized by the subject of the predication. It follows that when an NP is argumental (i.e., non predicative), all the realized arguments of its head N (if it has any apart from *R*) are internal to the NP, and consequently contained in it. On the contrary, when the NP is predicative, it necessarily has a realized external argument.

Returning to the examples (19) through (25) and (29), we observe the following phenomena —without the least exception:

(i) When they are contained in an NP, the genitives *elkarren* and *bere buruaren* are grammatical if and only if this NP is predicative; moreover, they are then bound to the subject of the predication in question.

(ii) Conversely, *bat bertzearen* and *bere* are grammatical when contained in an argumental NP — at least, if there is a binder "close enough"; furthermore, if they are contained in a predicative NP, they may never be bound to the subject of the predicate which contains them; consequently, they are either bound by a distinct NP, if there is one "close enough", or ruled out.

To account for these cases, then, we might informally say that *elkar(ren)* and *bere burua(ren)* are bound in the minimal syntactic category which contains them and all the realized arguments of the head N, whilst *bere* and *bat bertzea(ren)* must be free in that same domain. Thus, one might be tempted to generalize this description as follows:

(30) A PRONOUN α's AMGC is the minimal syntactic category/projection [10] which contains α, the head H of which α is an argument, and all the other *realized* arguments of H.

There is a difficulty, however: (30) works properly only insofar as the PRONOUN is the subject of the minimal category which contains it. Indeed, when it is not, (30) is not valid, since the object NP in the examples below contains α, its

(10) The expression "category/projection" is used so as to allow a reformulation of the definitions which would incorporate the idea that subjects are base-generated in the VP: in this case, the GC which corresponds to a secondary predicate and its subject (the object NP of the V) would not be the VP itself, but, assuming there is no Small Clause, the minimal projection of V which contains the object and its predicate, the main subject's trace being left out. See Williams (1987, 1989) for a rewording of the θ-criterion which does not block such an approach.

governor, and all the arguments of the head —respectively *picture, harremanak* or *solasaldiak*— but does not qualify as the anaphors' GC: [11]

(31) a. John$_i$ bought [$_{NP}$ a picture of him$_{*i}$/himself$_i$]
b. Jonek eta Peiok [$_{NP}$ elkarrekiko harremanak] hautsi
Jon-E and Peio-E *elkar*-G-with-AN exchanges-A broken
dituzte
AUX
'Jon and Peio have broken off (their mutual) relations'
c. Heiek [elkarren arteko solasaldiak] beti euskaraz
they *elkar*-G between-AN chats always Basque-in
dituzte
they-have-them
'They always have their conversations in Basque'

In other words, it seems impossible to do without the stipulation that a GC must contain a subject. Let us thus redefine the absolute MGC for a PRONOUN as in (32):

(32) A PRONOUN α's AMGC is the minimal syntactic category/projection which contains α, its governor γ, the head H α is an argument of, all the realized arguments of H, and a subject.

3.2.2. Admittedly, (32) is somewhat "heavy". It does seem necessary, though, to keep all its ingredients —but not its specific formulation, as we will shortly see. Let us adopt the following abbreviations: D(H) is the minimal syntactic domain which contains α and all the realized arguments of the head of which α is an argument (either lexically determined by the θ-grid of that head, or structurally determined, as in the case of "possessive" genitives); D(G) is the minimal syntactic domain which contains α and its governor (to be revised later); D(S) is the minimal syntactic domain which contains α and a subject (not necessarily distinct from α). To justify the empirical content of (32), then, we need only show that there are good reasons to maintain the three domains D(H), D(S) and D(G) distinct.

(i.a) D(S) may be wider than D(H); we have just noted that all the realized arguments of the head H of which α is an argument need not always include a subject (the angled brackets <,> indicate the boundaries of the actual GC):

(33) <Heiek [elkarrekilako harremanak] hautsi> dituzte
they *elkar*-G-with-AN exchanges-A broken AUX
"They have broken off (their mutual) relations" [cf. (31b)]

(i.b) Conversely, there may be a closer subject than the external argument of the head H=N —typically, the genitive PRONOUN itself in such structures as (24b), repeated here, as (34a) and (34b):

(11) I do not include examples such as *They bought* [$_{NP}$ *pictures of each other*] here, since *each other*, contrary to *elkar*, need only be bound in its possibly wider RGC.

(34) a. <Iñaki [*bere etsaia] da>
*"Iñaki$_i$ is his$_i$ enemy"
b. <Heiek [elkarren etsaiak] dira>
they-E *elkar*-G enemies they-are
"They are each other's enemies" [cf. (25c)]

Therefore, the argumental domain of the head and the domain of a subject may simply overlap, and it is their union that counts.[12]

(ii.a) D(G) is wider than D(S) in the case of ACI (or ECM) constructions. True enough, there are no such structures in Basque, but the case is widely attested in other languages, where it is easily shown that they do not imply "middle-distance binding" (i.e. in the RGC), since pronominals which must be free in their AMGC are out, as in:

(35) <They$_i$ expect [them$_{*i}$ to win]>

(ii.b) In its turn, D(S) may be wider than D(G), as (31b) or (33) illustrate.

(iii.a) D(G) vs. D(H). Although the head H and the governor γ often coincide (as 13) or (20)), they do not always do so: in ECM structures, the governor's domain order than that which contains all the realized arguments of the head which α is moment of, cf. (35); moreover, if "Nominal expressions" are DPs, the genitive ... is governed by δ while being a lexically determined, or purely structural,... of the N.

(iii.b) Conversely (34a,b) are instances of the case when D(H) wider than D(G). Here again, one cannot say that the argumental domain of the head H always includes α's governor's domain or *vice versa.*

3.2.3. However, it should be possible to tighten up (32), concentrating on point (iii) — the question just examined. On the one hand, in ECM structures, the reference to the Governor entails that all its arguments are potential (contra-)antecedents for the PRONOUN. See for instance (35), where, clearly, it is not sufficient to refer to the minimal projection which contains the Governor (i.e. the matrix VP) to identify the (AM)GC of *them.*

On the other hand, a PRONOUN may be related to a lexical governor with a θ-grid only indirectly; two cases are possible: (a) the governor γ is higher than the lexical head H (e.g. in DPs with a genitive PRONOUN or in ECM structures); (b) γ is lower than the head H (e.g. when the P or K which directly governs the PRONOUN has no argumental structure, but is subcategorized for by a V).[13] In both cases, it would seem useful to relate the PRONOUN to that lexical head H, so as to unify the two domains D(G) and D(H). One way of doing so is the following.

(12) The explicit reference to the *realized* arguments of the head H also helps eliminate the need of a specific description of PRONOUNs when they happen to be in a predicate — hence to eliminate the "Predicate Opacity Condition" and the associated definition of "Argument complex" of Williams (1980, 1989) — two notions that must be independently stipulated otherwise.

(13) Of course, I am not suggesting that such Ps or Ks are functional — given the recent developments in X-bar theory, it would be quite odd; it suffices to say that a head is lexical if it has a θ-grid or argument structure; otherwise, it is non-lexical.

(36) Let CGL be a chain of governors "L-related" in the sense that the chain of governors (γ_0, γ_i, ..., γ_n) is such that:
  a. each governor γ is non-lexical except either the first one, γ_0, or the last one, γ_n, and
  b. each γ_i locally governs the maximal projection of γ_{i+1}.

We could then define a PRONOUN's "L-governor" Γ as in (37), and the AMGC of any PRONOUN α as in (38):

(37) A PRONOUN α's L-governor Γ is:
  a. its governor γ if γ is lexical *or*
  b. the lexical governor Γ which is either the head or the tail of the CGL which contains α's governor γ if the latter is non lexical.

(38) A PRONOUN α's AMGC is the minimal syntactic projection which contains α,
  a. all the realized arguments of its L-governor Γ and
  b. a subject.[14]

3.3. The RGC

Turning to the Relativized Governing Category, let us remember the discussion at the end of section 3.1: there, it was noted that neither the notion "accessible SUBJECT" nor the notion "distinct subject" were really operative to describe the Basque facts. I would now like to suggest the following, only slightly distinct, hypothesis:

(39) A PRONOUN α's RGC is the minimal syntactic projection which contains α,
  a. all the realized arguments of its L-Governor Γ, and
  b. a SUBJECT β *distinct from, and excluding,* α.

(14) Although the presence of a subject is necessary for languages as strikingly different as English and Basque, it is quite possible that it is not universally required in the definition of an AMGC; for instance, the binding properties of Italian *se stesso* in (i), from Giorgi (1987: (7)), seem to imply that although this anaphor, like *bere burua, elkar* or perhaps *himself* must typically be bound in its AMGC rather than its RGC, the presence of a subject must crucially be excluded:

(i) *[la sua$_i$ [lettera di Maria a se stesso$_i$]]
the his letter from M. to *s.s.*
"his [possessor] letter by/from Maria to himself'

(ii) [la sua$_i$ [lettera di Maria a lui$_i$]]
the his letter from M. to him
"his [possessor] letter by/from Maria to him"

However, the inacceptability of (iii) below —her example (i.a), (footnote 6)— shows that the situation might be more complex:

(iii) *il suo libro di se stesso
the his book from/by *s.s.*
"his book by himself"

The crucial idea is (i) to require the presence of a SUBJECT rather than that of an ordinary subject (as in (32)) - thereby replacing the subject NP of a tensed clause by its Infl/Agr, and excluding the NP subjects of secondary predications [15] and (ii) to specify that it be distinct from, rather than accessible to, α (compare (1b)).

Many positive consequences follow from this slight change in the definition of the RGC. First, in the case of examples like (29), the embedded clause will by definition constitute the RGC of *here*, since, in a tensed or inflected clause, there always is a SUBJECT, and since this SUBJECT is always distinct from the subject NP and therefore from any material contained therein. More generally, this hypothesis accounts for the fact that, generally, languages do not offer "accessibility effects" (cf. Yang 1982).

Second, it also accounts for the problem which was rather dismissed than really dealt with in Chomsky (1986) —see footnote 1—, namely the problem of anaphors which directly instantiate the subject position in an embedded tensed clause, as in:

(40) *The boys expect [that [each other will win]]

Clearly, the ungrammaticality of this sentence has nothing to do either with BT-compatibility or with accessibility. But if the requirement is simply for the syntactic category/projection to possess a distinct SUBJECT, as suggested here, we predict the ungrammaticality of (40) —and the non-operativeness of the accessibility effect in this specific construction.

3.4. A few applications

3.4.1. Interestingly, many more Basque structures behave in conformity with the lexical specifications (18) and the definitions (38) and (39). Let us first consider examples in which the Basque PRONOUNs are governed by a P (a postposition in Basque). In all the examples given so far, the Ps are locative —in other words, they have an argumental or θ structure: the complement they govern denotes a place, but that place is the place occupied by some other item— an entity which, with respect to that Locative θ-role, is a "Theme". Now this Theme may of course never be expressed inside the PP.[16] It ensues that this Theme is the P's external argu-

(15) The reason why secondary predication subjects are excluded from the list of SUBJECTs (cf. the generalization (17)) should be clear by now: in such structures, there is no functional head —such as Infl— that would establish a non-lexical link between the predicative phrase and the subject phrase. Interestingly enough, PRO does not have the same properties according to whether it is the subject of an infinitival clause, as in (i), or the subject of a secondary predication, as in (ii):

(i) ?/??They$_i$ ordered the children$_j$ PRO$_j$ to get out of each other$_i$'s bedrooms

(ii) OK/?They$_i$ ordered the children$_j$ out of each other$_i$'s bedrooms

This difference in relative acceptability might thus well be attributable to the fact that the PRO in (i), but not that in (ii), has an Infl node associated with it, thereby transforming it into a proper SUBJECT (see also Manzini & Wexler (1987) for the relevance of untensed Infl in the determination of GCs). As for the contrast between (i), (ii) above and (iii) below, it is suggested in Rebuschi (in press-b) that (iii) is altogether out because *each other* may only be bound in its RGC (as in the first two examples above) when it cannot be bound in its AMGC i.e. [*each other's bedrooms*]; but here, it can be bound in it.

(iii) *They$_i$ ordered the children$_j$ PRO$_j$ to kiss each other$_i$

(16) See however Rebuschi (in press-a), who tentatively proposed to insert a PRO specifier in the PPs, after Chomsky's (1986) suggestion that NPs may also have PRO subjects. The empirical results of this section

ment.[17] In this perspective, let us look back on the examples (13) and (23), repeated here as (41) and (42) respectively.

(41) a. Heiek$_i$ sugeak$_j$ elkarren$_{*i/j}$ ondoan ikusi zituzten
they-E snakes-A *elkar*-G by-the-side seen AUX
"They$_i$ saw snakes$_j$ near each other$_{*i/j}$"
b. Heiek$_i$ sugeak$_j$ bat bertzearen$_{i/*j}$ ondoan ikusi zituzten
bat bertzea-G
"They$_i$ saw snakes$_j$ near each other$_{i/*j}$[18]"

(42) a. Peiok aberastasun handiak [bere baitan] baditu
Peio-E wealth big-PL-A "*bere* within he-has-them
"Peio$_i$ has great qualities in him$_{i/*j}$"
b. *Peiok aberastasun handiak [bere buruaren baitan] baditu
bere burua-G

We noted *supra* that in such cases the VP (or some lower projection of V) was the relevant syntactic segment as far as the identification of the AMGC was concerned. We are now in a position to give a principled account for this fact: in the examples above, the AMGC of the anaphors is again the minimal projection which contains (i) *all, and only, the realized arguments* of their L-governor Γ, and (ii) a subject.

Another typical instance is provided by the following contrast:

(43) a. Iñaki bere buruarekin mintzo da
I.-A *bere burua*-G-with talking AUX
"Iñaki is talking to himself"
b. *Iñaki berekin mintzo da
c. Iñaki harekin mintzo da
hura-G-with
"Iñaki is talking to him(*self)"

Let us assume that the postposition *-kin*, which governs the genitive, is a two-place relator too, hence a lexical head and L-governor for the PRONOUNs; its external Theme role will be realized in such cases by the subject of the V "talk", whence the grammaticality of *bere burua* in (43a), the ungrammaticality of *berekin* in (b) —the two domains AMGC and RGC coincide, as in the case of (8b) and

are indistinct (because the identification of the external argument of the L-governor of the PRONOUN is intuitively equivalent to Control), but it is to be hoped that the conceptual difficulties the PRO approach is bound to meet are now avoided. Yet a third variant might be devised after Safir's multiple Small clause approach — see footnote 4.

(17) In spite of the many similarities between Giorgi's (in press) approach and the one put forth here, I must underline that we radically differ on the θ status of PPs: for her (just as for Napoli 1989) a preposition *never* assigns an external θ-role.

(18) Giorgi (1984: 64a, b) reports the same type of contrast with Italian reflexives: *se stesso* thus seems to behave like *bere burua* and *elkar*, and *sé* like *bere* and *bat bertzea*.

(20b)—, and the disjoint reference that obtains in (c) —recall that *haren* must be free in its RGC (cf., (4b) and (5b)).

But what if *-kin* is a P without argumental structure? If it were the case, the PRONOUN it governs would be an argument of the V, which would then be its L-governor; as a consequence, the same results would be predicted: (i) *here burua* would be correctly bound in its AMGC, (ii) *here* would be out because the two GCs coindice, and (iii) *haren* would again have to be free in the clause.

Is the structure of (43) to stay ill-defined then? Note that if a direct object intervenes, as in (44), the two analyses make different predictions. If *-kin* is a lexical head with an argument structure, the direct object NP will count as its external argument, and the following (correct) configurations and indexations will obtain, since the AMGC of *here* and *here burua* will be some projection of V —the minimal projection of V which contains the direct object NP and the PP (perhaps the VP itself as sugested here for simplicity's sake); as a consequence, the only possible interpretation *here burua* in (44b) is one which does not make much sense extra-linguistically.

(44) a. Iñaki <[$_{VP}$ haurra berekin eraman]> du
I-E child-A *here*-with taken AUX
"Iñaki$_i$ has taken the child$_j$ away with him$_{i/*j/*k}$"
b. ?Iñakik [$_{VP}$ haurra bere buruarekin eraman] du
I.-E child-A *here burua*-G-with taken-away AUX
?"Iñaki$_i$ has taken the child$_j$ away with himself$_{*i/j}$"

On the other hand, if *-kin* had no lexical structure, its complement would be an argument of the verb; the subject NP would therefore belong to the PRONOUN's AMGC: one can easily see that the consequences would be contrary to the facts, since *here* should be ungrammatical in (a), and *here burua* should accept *Iñaki(k)* as a possible antecedent in (b).

To conclude this section devoted to PPs, let us finally observe the following sentences ((45a) is from Salaburu 1986).

(45) a. Heiek elkarren ondoan egin dute lo
they-E *elkar*-G by-the-side done AUX sleep
"They have slept side by side" [lit. "on each other's side"]
b. *Heiek elkarren oheetan egin dute lo
they-E *elkar*-G beds-in done AUX sleep
"They have slept side in each other's beds"

The difference in grammaticality is obviously due to the fact that *elkar* is the complement of the P *ondoan* in (a), whereas it is the subject of the direct object NP; in (b): it follows that the full clause is the anaphor's AMGC in the former case, whereas it is the object NP in the latter.

3.4.2. A quick look at adjectival complements within predicates will suffice to further illustrate the system proposed here. The English and Basque data are pa-

rallel: first, the PRONOUNs never are direct complements; second, they are nonetheless an *internal* argument of the adjectival head; finally, the external subject of that head is always realized, thereby necessarily coinciding with the subject which enters into the definition of the AMGC and with the "distinct SUBJECT" which characterizes the RGC. The following data need therefore no further comments (again, the angled brackets indicate the AMGCs of the PRONOUNs).[19]

(46) a. <Ian$_i$ is afraid of himself$_i$/him$_{*i/j}$>
b. <Iñaki bere buruaren / *bere beldur da>
I.-A *bere burua*-G *bere* afraid he-is
"Iñaki is afraid of himself"
c. <Iñaki haren beldur da>
haren
"Iñaki$_i$ is afraid of him$_{*i/j}$"

4. Consequences and Conclusion: A Second Look at *bere*

We have seen in section 2.1 that *bere* apparently has all the defining properties of an anaphor. In particular, it requires a "local" antecedent — in its RGC admittedly, but this is precisely the sort of binding domain the Chomskyan approach defines for an anaphor. But we have also seen that it has a less expected property: it is submitted to the requirement (9) that it be *free* in its AMGC. Therefore, it might be said to have both anaphoric *and* pronominal properties, in spite of the fact that it does not admit of split antecedents.[20] The question must therefore be asked: Is *bere* basically an anaphor, which also happens to marginally be a pronominal — or *vice versa?*

The absolute ungrammaticality of *bere* in (8b) points towards a fundamentally pronominal nature of *bere* —as opposed to the nature of *bat bertzea:* (20b) is much less deviant, and instances of this structure are even attested in 16th century Basque.

Another argument is provided by the following fact: contrary to what happens in the Indo-European languages which have both reflexive and non-reflexive possessives, *bere* can specify a subject NP/DP and have a direct or indirect object NP as its antecedent, as in (47a), and (47b,c), respectively —but cannot have a "non-term" as its antecedent, as shown by (47d).

(19) The Italian case illustrated hereafter (Giorgi 1984: (64c)), for which I have not been able to find a Basque equivalent without a tensed relative clause, shows that when an AP is inside a complex NP/DP, the head NP/DP (*il professore* below) functions like a subject, but not like a SUBJECT — whence the grammaticality of *sé* with both indices *i* and *j* (the brackets are mine).

(i) Osvaldo$_i$ ha visto [$_{NP}$ [il professore]$_j$ [contento di sé$_{i/j}$]]
Osvaldo has seen the professor pleased of *sé*
"O. has seen the professor pleased with himself.

This situation is reminiscent of the status of secondary predication subjects with respect to the extensional definition of SUBJECTs: here again, there is no functional head implied in the relation between the head NP and the anaphors's L-governor.

(20) See Walli & Subbarao (1990) for another case of non correspondence between anaphoricity and the no split antecedent requirement.

(47) a. Bere amak Peio maite du
bere mother-E Peio-A loves
"His$_{i/*j}$ mother loves Peio$_i$"

b. Bere ama Peiori mintzatu zaio
bere mother-A Peio-D spoken AUX
"His$_{i/*j}$ mother has talked to Peio$_i$"

c. Bere amak Peiori dirua eman dio
bere mother-E Peio-D money-A given AUX
"His$_{i/*j}$ mother has given Peio$_i$ the money"

d. *Bere ama Peioz mintzatu da
bere mother-A Peio-INS spoken AUX
"His$_i$ mother has talked about Peio$_i$"

To account for these facts, I proposed in Rebuschi (1986, 1989) a non-configurational analysis of clause structure in Basque: if there is no VP, an object NP can bind *bere* inside the subject NP just as the subject VP can bind *bere* inside a non subject (or a PP). However, that approach entailed the recognition of two distinct representations: Constituent Structure on the one hand, and Lexical Structure on the other (cf. Mohanan 1984) since anaphors like *elkar* "each other" or *bere burua* "himself" were ungrammatical as subjects; *bere* was then supposed to be bound in CS, and *elkar* or *bere burua* at LS.

As there was not too much independent evidence for this dual analysis, and some pretty telling evidence to the contrary — i.e. in favour of the existence of a VP in Basque CS —, Ortiz de Urbina (1989) has suggested that *bere* is simply an emphatic pronominal, which must be bound or licensed by a personal affix in the inflected verb.

However, the idea that the Agr affixes could bind PRONOUNs can be easily dismissed: if it were the case, non emphatic pronominals would never be allowed as subjects or objects in tensed sentences at all: they would always be bound, thereby systematically violating whatever version of BT Principle B one might think of. But those affixes are not licensers either: emphatic pronominals are licit even when they are not subjects or objects (i.e. are not cross-marked in the inflected verb form). Furthermore, in the northern dialects, the paradigms of "reflexive" genitives such as *bere* and of emphatic genitives are consistently distinct (cf. *bere* in (5a) vs *beraren* in (5b); for more details, see Rebuschi 1988).

Associated with this descriptive problem was a more theoretical one; as Sportiche (1986) put it, "natural languages never seem to impose locality requirements not involving c-command". In other words, we have here something that looks like a paradox: *bere* is submitted to some locality constraint (recall (29a,b)); however, if there is a VP, no c-command requirement governs its distribution.

This paradox, however, might well turn out to be a false one; indeed, as shown in detail in Rebuschi (1991), when *bere* is c-commanded by its antecedent, it induces either a strict identity reading, or a sloppy identity interpretation, as shown in (48b,c) respectively, whereas it never induces sloppy identity when its antecedent does not c-command it, cf. (49).

(48) a. Iñakik bere laguna ikusi du, eta Koldok ere bai
Iñaki-E *bere* friend-A seen AUX and Koldo-E also so
"Iñaki$_i$ has seen his$_{i/*j}$ friend, and Koldo (has ...) too"
b. "...and Koldo$_k$ has seen his$_i$ friend too" [*strict identity reading*]
c. "...and Koldo$_k$ has seen his$_k$ friend too" [*sloppy identity reading*]

(49) a. Bere lagunak Iñaki ikusi du, eta Koldo ere bai
bere friend-E Iñaki-A seen AUX and Koldo-A also so
"His$_{i/*j}$ friend has seen Iñaki$_i$, and Koldo too"
b. "...and his$_i$ friend has seen Koldo$_k$ too" [*strict identity reading*]
c. *"...and his$_k$ friend has seen Koldo$_k$ too" [*sloppy identity reading*]

It therefore seems clear that when *bere* is technically "bound" (i.e. c-commanded by the NP it is coindexed with), it behaves like a bound pronominal rather than like an anaphor (since real anaphors normally only induce sloppy identity readings) [21] —and that when it is inside the subject NP, it is just not bound at all, i.e. it behaves (almost) like an ordinary pronominal— "almost" because, contrary to what usually happens crosslinguistically, it remains submitted to a special constraint, the constraint that it be *coindexed* (although not bound!) in its RGC.

Now this is not too costly, from a theoretical point of view, once it has been noticed, as we have done, that *bere* must be free in its Absolute Minimal Governing Category —and that it is only in its wider, *Relativized* Governing Category that it is submitted to that somewhat exotic constraint.

There is, however, a less exotic consequence to the foregoing description: we have to accept the idea that what I have called the RGC is *not* basic —i.e. that the really *local* condition which is, in Sportiche's words, universally constrained by c-command, is what I have called the AMGC. In other words, such facts suggest that we return to a pre-*LGB* format, when Chomsky (1979: 23-25) considered that *each other* in such examples as (50a,b) represent "a case where the general theory is relaxed, to yield marked constructions".[22]

(50) a. They read [each other's books]
b. They heard [stories about each other]

In fact, if the final definition of the AMGC (38), repeated as (51) below, is on the right track, only (50a) should be considered a marked case; but if the reference to a subject is already in itself a (counter-)opacity factor, as suggested by Koster (1987) and in footnote (14), both sentences really belong to the "periphery".

(21) Compare Bouchard's (1985) words "false anaphors". It is worth nothing that long distance binding seems always to induce *either* sloppy *or* strict identity, i.e. that long distance would-be anaphors really are bound pronominals, in fact. Here is a Japanese example from Kawasaki (1989: footnote 5) which is all the more revealing as the antecedent is a quantified phrase (See however Saito & Hoji (1983: 257) for a contrary view.):
(i) John-dake-ga [zibun-ga tasukar-u-to] omotte i-ta
J.-only-NOM *zibun*-NOM be-saved-Pres-Comp think-past
"Only John believed that he would survive" [sloppy *or* strict]

(22) Quoted in Botha (1989: 85).

(51) A PRONOUN α's AMGC is the minimal syntactic projection which contains α, all the realized arguments of its L-Governor Γ, and a subject.

Moreover, the study of the various Basque PRONOUNs undertaken here, and in particular that of the pseudoreflexive genitive *here*, can help us better understand the crucial distinction Bouchard (*op. cit.*, 124) has established between "semantic anaphors" (entities that need "a linguistic antecedent, because they cannot refer extralinguistically") and "syntactic" ones (items which "bear a specific relation with their antecedent, this relation being obligatory, one-to-one, local, and structurally conditioned"). From this point of view, we can suggest that although northern Basque *here* is clearly a *semantic* anaphor, it is not a *syntactic* one; in a sense, it is even the perfect antithesis of Dogrib *ye* —a syntactic anaphor which is at the same time a semantic pronominal (see Enç 1989).

Yet, many questions remain unanswered, which clearly deserve further research. Let me simply mention the following two, which seem particularly important:

(i) Can the presence of the "distinct SUBJECT" required in the definition of the RGC (39) be derived from more general principles, or is it only a particular realization, in English and in Basque, of the more general hierarchy of counter-opacity factors propounded by Manzini & Wexler (1987)? [23]

(ii) What independent evidence is there — outside BT-related facts — in favour of our thesis that many Ps, just as Vs, Ns and As, have external arguments — and, more generally, for the operativeness of the notion "(minimal syntactic projection which contains all the arguments of the) PRONOUN's L-governor" — at least, inasmuch as it is empirically distinct from the minimal domain Koster (1987) derives from his Bounding Condition on the one hand, and from "θ-domains" on the other?

5. References

Botha, R. P., 1989, *Challenging Chomsky*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bouchard, D., 1985, "The Binding Theory and the Notion of Accessible SUBJECT", *LI* 16/1, 117-133.

Chomsky, N., 1981a, "Markedness and Core Grammar", in A. Belletti, L. Brandi & L. Rizzi (eds.) *Theories of Markedness in Generative Grammar* (Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore).

———, 1981b, *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

———, 1986, *Knowledge of Language*. New York: Praeger.

Enç, M., 1989, "Pronouns, Licensing, and Binding", *NLLT* 7/1, 51-92.

Giorgi, A., 1984, "Toward a Theory of Long Distance Anaphors: a GB Approach", *The Linguistic Review* 3/4, 307-361.

———, 1987, "The Notion of Complete Functional Complex: Some Evidence from Italian", *LI* 18/3, 511-518.

(23) Of course, a SUBJECT will always help define a syntactic domain at least as wide as a subject NP —cf. Manzini & Wexler's (1987) results: tense and agreement always function as counter opacity factors. But that is hardly a theoretical answer (see footnote 15 for a possible direction for future research).

———, (in press). "Prépositions, liage, et thêta-marquage", in J. Guéron & J.-Y. Pollock (eds.), *Grammaire générative et syntaxe comparée,* Paris: Presses du CNRS.
Huang, C. T. J., 1983, "A Note on the Binding Theory", *LI* 14/3, 554-561.
Kawasaki, N., 1989, "*Jibun-tachi* and Non-coreferential Anaphora", ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Koster, J., 1987, *Domains and Dynasties.* Dordrecht: Foris.
Lebeaux, D., 1983, "A Distributional Difference between Reciprocals and Reflexives", *LI* 14/4, 723-730.
Manzini, R. & Wexler, K., 1987, "Parameters, Binding Theory, and Learnability", *LI* 18/3, 413-444.
Mohanan, K. P., 1984, "Lexical and Configurational Structures", *The Linguistic Review* 3, 113-139.
Napoli, D. J., 1989, *Predication Theory.* Cambridge (U.K.): Cambridge University Press.
Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989, *Parameters in the Grammar of Basque.* Dordrecht, Foris.
Rebuschi, G., 1986, "Pour une représentation syntaxique duale: structure syntagmatique et structure lexicale en basque", *ASJU* 20/3, 683-704.
———, 1988, "Note sur les pronoms dits «intensifs» du basque", *ASJU* 22/3, 827-844.
———, 1989, "Is There a VP in Basque?", in L. Marácz and P. Muysken (eds.): *Configurationality: the Typology of Asymmetries* (Dordrech: Foris), 85-116.
———, 1991, "Binding at LF vs. Obligatory (Counter-)Coindexation at SS: a Case Study", in J. A. Lakarra (ed.), *Memoriae Mitxelena magistri sacrum,* Publications of *ASJU* 14 Donostia.
———, (in press-a) "Basque Pronouns and Relativized Locality" in J. I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Basque Studies in Generative Grammar,* Amsterdam, Benjamins.
———, (in press-b) "Théorie du liage et localité relativisée", in H. G. Obenauer (ed.), *Structure de la phrase et théorie du liage,* Proceedings of the CNRS Round Table on the same topic, Paris, March 1990.
Riemsdijk, H. van, 1985, "Why Long Reciprocals don't Exist", *Theoretical Linguistic Research* 2/1, 37-45.
Safir, K., 1983, "On Small Clauses as Constituents", *LI* 14/4, 730-735.
Saito, M. & Hoji, H., 1983, "Weak Crossover and Move Alpha in Japanese", *NLTT* 1/2, 245-259.
Salaburu, P., 1986, "La teoría del ligamiento en la lengua vasca", *ASJU* 20/2, 395-412.
Sportiche, D., 1986, *"Zibun", LI* 17/3, 369-374.
Walli, K. & Subbarao, K. V., 1990, "Bound Pronouns and the Classification of Nominal Expressions", ms., Syracuse, Cornell and Delhi Universities.
Williams, E., 1980, "Predication", *LI* 11/1, 203-238.
———, 1987, "Implicit Arguments, the Binding Theory, and Control", *NLLT* 5/2, 151-180.
———, 1989, "The Anaphoric Nature of θ-rôles", *LI* 20/3, 425-456.
Yang, D.-W., 1983, "The Extended Binding Theory of Anaphors", *Language Research* 19/2, 169-192.