

## Anaphors vs. Pronouns: differences at the numeration

**Aim:** The purpose of this work is to provide a principled account that derives Binding Conditions (BCs) A and B (1) for free. Specifically, I identify the numeration as the trigger of BCs; I argue that its properties (size) and mechanisms (*Select*) are responsible for the binding behaviour as well as the complimentary distribution of pronouns and anaphors.

**Theoretical background:** Chomsky's (1981) BCs A and B (and C) are nowadays understood as a description of the binding behaviour of referential elements (i.e. anaphors and pronouns (and r-expressions)).

Within the Minimalist Program, there are at least three ways of explaining these conditions: LF accounts (Chomsky 1995); movement proposals (Kayne 2002; Drummond *et al.* 2010); and analyses that combine syntactic and LF mechanisms (Reuland 2001). *A priori*, these analyses all capture the general facts; however, the underlying reason for the complimentary distribution of anaphors and pronouns remains mysterious.

**The proposal:** On the basis of *Full Interpretation* (i.e. no symbols or derivations are superfluous), I hypothesize the configuration of anaphors and pronouns, as it should be conceived in the numeration.

I assume the numeration is formed in an l-syntactic way (Hale & Keyser 2002), where features from the Lexicon are grouped to form different syntactic objects (classified under semantic types). When forming an *entity* in the numeration (Hale & Keyser 2002), I propose that a number feature is required. Pronouns include this feature while anaphors do not (Reuland 2001). *Select* is taken to be the procedure that picks grouped features from the numeration and derives them to form a sentence. Each application of *Select* introduces distinguished objects in the derivation (Chomsky 1995). Following this logic, I claim that anaphors do not appear in the numeration, while pronouns do.

Anaphors are not in the numeration at all, but rather derived by *move*. One sole object (NP or DP) is introduced in the derivation. The object *moves* to satisfy a  $\theta$ -role (Kayne 2002), and a reflexive element is pronounced in the lower position, because it is case marked.

Pronouns, on the other hand, appear as an entity in the numeration, and are introduced independently in the derivation. Because they fall under an application of *Select*, their reference is distinguished from other references within the same numeration.

In other words, locality constraints — key to the complementary distribution of anaphors and pronouns — are proposed to match the size of the numeration and follow from the operation *Select*. Nonetheless, examples where both anaphors and pronouns can appear (2) challenge the proposal. I assume *Merge* is the combination of *Concatenation*+ *Labelling* (Hornstein 2009) and I suggest that the lack of *labelling* is responsible for ambiguous locality domains.

**Further extensions:** By analysing adjuncts as unlabelled constituents — and by assuming that this is relevant to locality — we can account for the apparent lack of complementary distribution in examples of the sort in (2).

I take lack of *labelling* to have strong PF consequences: unlabelled objects are linearized at the edges of the phases where they are merged. This being the case, they can be computed as belonging to the inner or outer phase, which immediately licenses an anaphor or a pronoun respectively.

**Examples:**

- 1) a. Juan<sub>i</sub> se<sub>i</sub> quiere / \* Juan<sub>i</sub> lo<sub>i</sub> quiere  
John SE<sub>ANAPH</sub> loves / John him loves  
'John loves himself.' / 'John loves him.'
- b. \*Juan<sub>i</sub> dice [que sí<sub>i</sub> tiene razón] / Juan<sub>i</sub> dice [que él<sub>i</sub> tiene razón]  
John says [that SE<sub>ANAPH</sub> have reason] / John says [that he has reason]  
'John says that himself is right.' / 'John says that he is right.'
- 2) a. [María oyó voces terroríficas [detrás de sí]]  
[Mary heard voices terrifying [behind (of) SE<sub>ANAPH</sub>]]  
'Mary heard terrifying voices behind herself.'
- b. [María oyó voces terroríficas] [detrás de ella]  
[Mary heard voices terrifying] [behind (of) her]  
'Mary heard terrifying voices behind her.'

---

**References**

- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris: Dordrecht
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge/ MA: The MIT Press
- Drummond, Alex, Norbert Hornstein & Dave Kush. 2010. Minimalist construal. Two approaches to A and B. Ms. UMD
- Hale, Ken and Samuel J. Keyser. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. Cambridge/ MA: The MIT Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2009. *A theory of syntax. Minimal Operations and Universal Grammar*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 2002. Pronouns and their antecedents. In Epstein & Seely (eds.) *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*. Oxford/ MA: Blackwell. 133-166.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32 (3): 439-492.