A NEW APPROACH TO GOVERNING CATEGORY
AND ACCESSIBLE SUBJECT

Elisa Vázquez Iglesias
University of Santiago de Compostela

This paper aims to contribute to filling some of the descriptive and theoretical gaps in the literature of Spanish generative grammar, as far as binding is concerned. It is gaps in Spanish generative grammar, as far as binding is concerned. In the BT it has been generally assumed that the three Principles or Conditions that limit the binding of anaphors and pronominals are universal. If they, in fact, hold for all languages in the world, we must specify the peculiarities of each language. In this sense, I claim that a revision of the traditional definitions of *Governing category*, *SUBJECT / subject*, and *Accessibility* is required in Spanish, since these three notions are clear examples of parametric variation across languages. Along these lines and after comparing the behavior of Spanish versus English anaphors and pronominals, I also propose a slight modification of *Accessibility* and *GC* in English.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to point out some inadequacies in the BT that make it necessary to revise such an approach. I will analyze several questions that arise from the traditional definitions of *governing category* and *accessible subject*, first introduced by Chomsky (1981) and given in (1-3) below:

(1) is a *Governing category* fo iff it is the minimal domain containing, a governor for, and a SUBJECT, which, if is an anaphor, is accessible to.

(2) is an *accessible* subject / SUBJECT for if the coindexation between between and does not violate any grammatical principles, (Chomsky 1981a, 211-2) such as the *i-within-i principle*, defined in (3) below:

(3) A part of a constituent cannot be accessible to the whole constituent.

At first sight, these questions may seem to focus on ternimological matters alone. However, a closer look at the comparative analysis provided in this paper will show that a more theoretical problem is at stake here. Let us consider now one of the two languages that will be contrasted: Spanish. First of all, what does Accessible SUBJECT mean in the case of Spanish?. Could we just use Subject in the traditional sense of the word?. What does Accessibility refer to?. In the following sections I will discuss all these issues in order to show that the definitions given in (1-3) only apply to English, and not to Spanish.

2. ACCESSIBLE SUBJECT / SUBJECT

First of all, we need to distinguish *subject* from SUBJECT. Roughly speaking, a *subject* is an NP that occupies the Specifier position of an XP. The concept of SUBJECT was first proposed by Chomsky (1981) to account for the contrast between (4a) and (4b)

(4) a. *John$_i$ thinks [$_{CP}$ that [$_{IP}$ himself$_i$ is a good writer].
b. John$_i$ thinks [$_{CP}$ that [a picture of himself$_i$ was on sale].

According to Chomsky, in (4a) the GC for the anaphor is the embedded CP, that includes the anaphor, its governor, I, and an accessible SUBJECT, namely, AGR (or INFL). He argues that if we only considered the real subject, *John*, as the proper antecedent for the anaphor, Condition A would be satisfied. This seems quite plausible for the English data. However, this kind of coindexation between AGR and the anaphor appears rather *ad hoc*, especially in Spanish. I claim that we do not need to take AGR as accessible SUBJECT in this language. The Spanish counterparts to (4a-b) are both grammatical, as long as we use a nominative anaphor, *él mismo*, in (4a), because of the case distinctions we make (recall that *él mismo* is allowed both in nominative and accussative / dative forms, while *sí mismo* can never occur in a nominative position). This is shown in (4c) and (4d) below:

(4) c. Juan$_i$ cree que él mismo$_i$ es un buen escritor.
   d. Juan$_i$ cree que una foto de sí mismo$_i$ estaba a la venta.

We notice that the same results in grammaticality are obtained in (4c) and (4d). This supports my hypothesis that only a DP can be truly coindexed with the anaphor.

Once we got rid of SUBJECT in the definition of G.C in Spanish, the next step would be to see what makes a subject "accessible" in this language. As I have already mentioned, not any DP will do. We need to check and describe what properties a DP must have in order to qualify as proper antecedent for an anaphor.

Consider the following data in Spanish:

(5) a. Ana$_i$ pensaba [que aquella casa todavía le pertenecía a sí misma$_i$]
   b. Ana believed that that house still belonged to PRONOUN-MISMA (herself)
(6) a. Juan$_i$ sabía [que aquella casa era de su propia$_i$ madre].
   b. Juan knew that that house was SELF's (his own) mother.
(7) a. Luisa$_i$ convenció a Ana$_j$ [de que aquella casa le pertenecía a sí misma$_{i/j}$].
   b. Luisa convinced Ana that that house still belonged to PRONOUN-MISMA (herself).

Examples (5), (6), (7) seem to be problematic for the BT: if we assume that the embedded clause is the GC for the reflexive, then it is free inside it, violating Principle A. The problem here lies on how we are to define "accessible subject". My proposal for Spanish involves getting rid of this accessibility condition as it is defined by Chomsky. Taking into account the distinction between local *se* and *sí mismo* versus LD *su propio*, I argue that an "accessible subject" for the reflexive must be a non-embedded DP, as long as it has the semantic feature [+animate]. In the case of locally bound anaphors the accessible DP must be inside their respective GCs, while LD *su propio* is not subject to this requirement. Let us see more data supporting this argument:

(8) a. *La mesa$_i$ tenía un libro sobre sí (misma)$_i$.
   b. The table had a book on PRONOUN-MISMA (itself)
(9) a.*El café$_i$ olía a sí mismo$_i$.
   b.The coffee smelled of PRONOUN-MISMO (itself)
(10) a.*El barco$_i$ tiene sus propias$_i$ banderas.
   b.The ship has SELF's (its own) flags.
(11) a.*El jardín$_i$ conserva sus propios$_i$ arbustos.
   b.The garden still has SELF's (its own) bushes.

The (a) cases are ruled out by the BT because there is no accessible subject for the reflexive in any of them. If DPs characterized as [-animate], such as *la mesa, el café, el barco, el jardín*, were coindexed with their respective reflexive, then they would become grammatical. The English counterparts to these examples, given in the (b) cases, show that both the *-self* forms and the *possessive pronoun + own* allow these inanimate subjects as proper

antecedents. Moreover, these same verbs could be used with animate subjects and the sentences would be judged acceptable, both in Spanish and English, as we see below:

(12) a. Ana$_i$ tenía un libro sobre sí misma$_i$.
a'. Ana had a book over PRONOUN-MISMO (herself)
b. Ana$_i$ olía a sí misma$_i$.
b'. Ana smelled of PRONOUN-MISMA (herself)
(13) a. Ana$_i$ tiene sus propios$_i$ libros.
a'. Ana has SELF's (her own) books.
b. Ana$_i$ conserva sus propias$_i$ muñecas.
b'. Ana keeps SELF's (her own) dolls.

Let us test now some sentences with different verbs whose subjects are [+animate] NP/ DPs. If my preliminary assumption is correct, we will expect these sentences to be grammatical as well. The data appear in (14):

(14) a. María$_i$ lee sus propios$_i$ libros.
a'. María reads SELF's (her own) books.
b. El perro$_i$ muerde su propia$_i$ cola.
b'. The dog bites SELF's (her own) tail.
c. El periódico$_i$ publica sus propias$_i$ noticias.
c'. The paper publishes SELF's (its own) news.

It is clear that whenever we have an NP / DP of this kind, coindexation with the reflexive is always possible. Even though in (14c) there seems to be an [-animate] DP, the gram- maticality we get is explained because it refers to all the employees working for that newspaper. They are, in fact, the ones who publish the news.

There is a further point to take into consideration at this moment. Examples under (15) and (16) below indicate that it is possible for the reflexive to have just an object as its binder. This happens when the features of the subject and those of the reflexive do not match.

(15) a. Yo$_i$ considero a Juan$_j$ orgulloso de sí mismo$_{*i/j}$.
b. I consider Juan proud of PRONOUN-MISMO (himself).
(16) a. Tú$_i$ convenciste a Juan$_j$ de que la casa era de sí mismo$_{*i/j}$.
b. You convinced Juan that the house belonged to PRONOUN-MISMO (himself).

All the examples I have provided above lead me to conclude that Chomsky's idea of "accessibility" needs to be revised, and not only in Spanish, but also in English. Recall that, in Chomsky's terms, "accessibility" is restricted to "SUBJECT / subject". However, we notice that in the English glosses to (15) and (16) the anaphor, *himself*, can only be coindexed with the object, and never with the subject, since the latter does not agree with the reflexive. It seems quite accurate to make up a new definition of "accessibility" in both languages to solve these inadequacies present in the BT since Chomsky (1981). In (17a) below, I provide a slight but, in my opinion, crucial modification to the definition of "accessibility" in English. In (17b) I define this same concept in the case of Spanish.

(17) a. is *accessible* to in English iff
i. is INFL or AGR or
ii. is an NP subject / object that has the same features as.
iii. coindexation between and does not violate the *i-within-i* filter.

(17) b. is *accessible* to in Spanish iff
i. is not INFL or AGR
ii. is an NP subject / object that is [+animate] and has the same features as.
iii. coindexation between and does not violate the *i-within-i filter*.

So far, I have shown that SUBJECT can be eliminated as an accessible subject for the anaphor in Spanish, but not in English. I have argued that not every DP is accessible to the anaphor. Those bearing the semantic feature [-animate] are not accessible, so that in these cases the GC is extended to a higher clause (if there is one) with a proper antecedent. I tried to demonstrate that any subject or object fulfilling this condition, no matter how superordinate it is, can be a proper antecedent for anaphors such as *sí mismo* and *su propio* in Spanish, and the *-self* forms in English, as long as their features match. What happens, then, if two NPs share the same nominal features with the reflexive? Could the latter be coindexed with both of them?. On the one hand, it is obvious that locally bound anaphors, both in English and Spanish, must corefer with their nearest antecedent, which, in the case of a transitive verb, will always be an object. If the verb is intransitive, the subject will behave as the antecedent of the anaphor. On the other hand, the behavior of LD anaphors is rather different, since they can take any subject or object as their antecedent. In sum, the notion of "accessible subject / SUBJECT" is better expressed as "accessible DP / NP". In this way, we include objects that, under certain grammatical conditions, behave as antecedents of the anaphor.

3. GOVERNING CATEGORY AND BINDING OF SPANISH PRONOMINALS

Let us focus on the notion of GC. Once the Accessibility requirement has been modified for Spanish, we might think that the traditional definition of *governing category* needs no further change. This would be the case if we only took into account the binding domains for Spanish anaphors. However, the BT is concerned with pronominals as well, and these prove more problematic. It is assumed in this theory and in its more recent minimalist approach to binding that, according to Principle B, a pronominal must be free inside its GC. Therefore, a violation of this Principle seems to occur whenever we find a bound pronoun in a sentence. Huang (1983) suggested that anaphors and pronominals have different binding domains. Recall that anaphors require their antecedent to be inside its GC, while pronominals do not. The existence of a "defective" binding domain for pronominals is necessary in order to explain their coindexation with a subject or even with an object without violating Condition B of the BT. Along these lines, Hestvik (1990) also proposed subjectless binding domains for pronominals and extended this notion not only to DPs / NPs and PPs but also to APs. I leave APs aside since they only provide additional evidence for the existence of *defective governing categories*.

In previous sections, we have seen how the formal definition of GC works for Spanish anaphors, as long as we eliminate that SUBJECT. At the same time, the behavior of English anaphors is perfectly accounted for in Chomsky's definitions. Now, we will analyze the behavior of pronominals inside / outside their GCs in these two languages.

3.1. PRONOMINALS INSIDE DPs

Only possessive pronouns occur inside DPs. They function as determiners of a subjectless DP. Both in English and Spanish, these DPs function as defective GCs where the pronoun is free, satisfying thus Condition B.

(18) a. Ana$_i$ lee su$_{i/j}$ libro.
a'. Ana$_i$ reads her$_{i/j}$ book.
b. Su$_j$ padre quiere a Ana$_i$.
b'. Her$_{i/j}$ father loves Ana$_i$.

Taking for granted that the possessive pronoun must be free in its governing category, the DP is the only possible domain for it in (18a-b). This is one of the very few cases where we find defective GCs in English. (18b) is an example of an experiencing verb, where there is a lack of c-command between the pronoun and the R-expression. The latter binds the possessive pronoun through an m-command relation at D-structure. The syntactic representation is shown in (19):

(19) a. [$_{IP}$ [Su$_i$ padre$_j$ [$_{I'}$ quiere$_k$ [$_{VP}$ [t$_j$ [$_{V'}$ t$_k$ [$_{NP}$ (a) Ana$_i$]]]]]]]
b. [$_{IP}$ [His$_i$ father$_j$ [$_{I'}$ loves$_k$ [$_{VP}$ [t$_j$ [$_{V'}$ t$_k$ [$_{NP}$ Ana$_i$]]]]]]].

3.2. PRONOMINALS INSIDE PPS

Pronominals inside PPs are not as straightforward as they may seem. In Spanish, they may occur in three main positions:

3.2.1. PP ARGUMENTS AND ADJUNCTS THAT ARE REQUIRED BY THE VERB

Some verbs in Spanish require PP arguments to complete their meanings. The English counterparts to these verbs are usually the so-called *prepositional verbs*. They assign a certain preposition to their complements.

Let us consider the following data:

(20) a. Juan$_j$ confía en él$_{i/j}$.
a'. Juan$_i$ trusts him$_{*i/j}$.
b. Juan$_i$ sueña con él$_{i/j}$.
b'. Juan$_i$ dreams about him$_{*i/j}$.
c. Juan$_i$ depende de él$_{i/j}$.
c'. Juan$_i$ depends on him$_{*i/j}$.

In (20a-c) *él* can corefer with the subject *Juan* without yielding a Condition B violation. The behavior of the pronominal *him* in English is quite diferent, as we see from the coindexation facts above. As Hestvik has argued, not all PPs can be treated as GCs for the pronouns. However, his approach differs from that taken here. He argues that there are certain prepositions that do not assign roles and, therefore, the pronominals are inside PPs that do not constitute binding domains. I claim that the notion of *subjectless binding domain* is related not only to the role borne by the whole PP but also to the subcategorization of the verb in question. Consider (21) below:

(21) a. Pedro$_i$ habla con él$_{*i/j}$.
a'. Pedro$_i$ talks to him$_{*i/j}$.
b. Pedro$_i$ habla para él$_{*i/j}$.
b'. Pedro$_i$ talks to him$_{*i/j}$.

Were these PPs to be analyzed as GCs, coindexation between the pronoun and the subject would be possible. However, we note that these sentences are ungrammatical under that reading, both in English and Spanish.

At first sight, it looks as if these different grammaticality judgements between (20) and (21) were due to the fact that whereas the verbs in (20), *confiar* (en) "to trust", *soñar* (con) "to dream about / of", *depender de* "to depend on", require the use of a certain preposition, the verb *hablar* "to talk" in (21) can be followed by different prepositions (*con, para.*). Nervetheless, a further piece of evidence indicates that this cannot be the reason for expanding the GC to the whole clause. Look at the pair of sentences below:

(21) c. Pedro$_i$ habla sobre él$_{i/j}$.
    c'. Pedro$_i$ talks about him$_{*i/j}$.
    d. Pedro$_i$ habla de él$_{i/j}$.
    d'. Pedro$_i$ talks about him$_{*i/j}$.

(21c-d) lead us to think that something else is happening. The similarities between (20a-b) and (21c-d) are clearly related to the argument structure of the verb. Verbs like *confiar*, *soñar*, and *depender* take an Experiencer as their external argument and a Theme as the internal argument. *Hablar* takes an Agent as its subject and a Theme as its complement. It seems that every time the PP is an argument of the verb the pronominal can be coindexed either with the subject or with someone else in the discourse. It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that a PP argument must be always considered a Complete Functional Complex. Let us check whether or not this is correct when other verbs are used. Take, for example, *pensar* "to think" and *mirar* "to look" in (23) below:

(22) a. Juan$_i$ piensa mucho en él$_{i/j}$.
    a'. Juan$_i$ thinks a lot about him$_{*i/j}$.
    b. Juan$_i$ piensa mucho sobre él$_{i/j}$.
    b'. Juan$_i$ thinks a lot about him$_{*i/j}$.

Pensar takes both an Agent and a Theme as its arguments. Once again, the PP aguments behave as GCs for the pronominals, just as in (21c-d) above.

Now, consider *mirar* in the examples below:

(23) a. Juan$_i$ mira hacia él$_{i/j}$.
    a'. Juan$_i$ is looking at him$_{*i/j}$.
    b. Juan$_i$ mira para él$_{i/j}$.
    b'. Juan$_i$ is looking at him$_{*i/j}$.

Mirar selects two arguments, [Agent, Theme]. In this case, however, the Theme is not present and a Goal seems to be required by the semantics of the verb. I argue that these PPs are not truly adjuncts as those given in (24) and (25) below. An important argument supporting this suggestion is the fact that both sentences in (23) can be replaced by *Juan se mira* "Juan SELF looks at", and the meaning does not change. Obviously, the clitic *se* is an argument (i.e. D.O) of the verb. Therefore, the PPs above are somehow functioning as Theme arguments.

Consider further examples with verbs like *cantar*, *estudiar* and *correr*. The data in (24a-c) shows, once more, that adjuncts (a "co-Agent" and a "Goal" in these cases) do not constitute CFCs for the pronominals, while (24d) confirms our assumption that PP arguments are, in fact, subjectless binding domains.

(24) a. Juan$_i$ canta con él$_{*i/j}$.
    a'. Juan$_i$ sings with him$_{*i/j}$.
    b. Juan$_i$ canta hacia él$_{*i/j}$.
    b'. Juan$_i$ sings towards him$_{*i/j}$.
    c. Juan$_i$ canta para él$_{*i/j}$.
    c'. Juan$_i$ sings for him$_{*i/j}$.
    d. Juan$_i$ canta sobre él$_{i/j}$.
    d'. Juan$_i$ sings about him$_{*i/j}$.

Cantar requires an Agent and a Theme. The coindexation facts shown in (24) prove that the PP adjuncts in the first three sentences are not CFCs. (24d) supports our proposal that only PPs whose roles are required by the verb consitute CFCs.

Further evidence in favor of this assumption is given in (25) below:

(25) a. Juan$_i$ estudia con él$_{*i/j}$.
    a'. Juan$_i$ studies with him$_{*i/j}$.
    b. Juan$_i$ estudia para él$_{i/*j}$.
    b'. Juan$_i$ studies for him$_{i/j}$.
    c. Juan$_i$ estudia sobre él$_{i/j}$.
    c'. Juan$_i$ studies about him$_{*i/j}$.

Estudiar is classified in the lexicon as a verb that takes an Agent and a Theme. (25a-a') indicate that in Spanish as well as in English the CFC is the whole clause so that the subject is not allowed to corefer with the pronominal, this being inside an adjunct. In (25b-b') we get an unexpected coindexation between the subject and the pronominal. Here we have a PP adjunct whose thematic role is Beneficiary of the action of *estudiar / to study*. Assuming that adjuncts extend the CFC of the pronominal to the whole clause, only somebody else in the discourse could corefer with *él / him*. However, what happens is just the opposite: The coindexation that should be possible is ungrammatical, whereas the one that should be ruled out is grammatical. These odd binding relations take place just in a few idioms, and depend more on the semantics of the verb than on anything else. There is no way of accounting for these idioms syntactically. They are exceptional cases to our proposal that all PP arguments are CFCs. (25c) is an example of a PP argument constituting a binding domain.

A common intransitive verb in Spanish is *correr*. As such, it is only required to take an Agent as its external argument. When this verb is modified by an adjunct, coindexation with the subject is never allowed, as we see in (26):

(26) a. Juan$_i$ corre hacia él$_{*i/j}$.
    a'. Juan$_i$ runs to him$_{*i/j}$.
    b. Juan$_i$ corre con él$_{*i/j}$.
    b'. Juan$_i$ runs with him$_{*i/j}$.

On the basis of the data provided in this section, we would be tempted to conclude that PPs are *weak* binding domains for pronominals in Spanish, but never in English. By weak, I mean that they are not always CFCs but, frequently, they behave as such. As the data above show, in a language like Spanish they depend heavily on the semantics of verbs (i.e.whether they take arguments or not). We have seen that PPs introduced by the same preposition may be CFCs or not. In sum, it is the distinction between PP arguments versus PP adjuncts (contra Hestvik) that accounts for the different coindexation facts we get in PPs that look alike. We have shown that any PP argument constitutes a CFC, while a PP adjunct does not. Let us see what happens in 2.2.2.

3.2.2 VERBS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A PP ADJUNCT

So far, I have just focused on PPs required by the semantics of the verb and I have argued that PP adjuncts are not CFCs for pronominals, neither in Spanish nor in English. We know that the roles generally associated with adjuncts are Beneficiary, Goal and Location. I have already dealt with the first two in previous sections. A closer look at some data concerning completely optional adjuncts, i.e.those whose role is [Location], will prove that the generalization made earlier in this paper that PP adjuncts are not CFCs is not true. As a matter of fact, the matrix subject is a possible antecedent for the pronoun whenever the DO of a transitive verb is present, both in English and Spanish. This shows that there are certain PP adjuncts that can be defined as subjectless binding domains in English and Spanish. Let us consider the data given in (27) below:

(27) a. Juan$_i$ cerró la puerta tras él$_{i/j}$.

a'. Juan$_i$ closed the door behind him$_{i/j}$.
b. Juan$_i$ vio una serpiente cerca de él$_{i/j}$.
b'. Juan$_i$ saw a snake near him$_{i/j}$.
c. Juan$_i$ vio a Pedro$_j$ delante de él$_{i/*j/k}$.
c'. Juan$_i$ saw Pedro$_j$ in front of him$_{i/k}$.

In (27) the PPs behave as subjectless binding domains even though they are adjuncts. Obviously, in neither case is the role borne by the PP a Beneficiary or a Goal. All these examples have PP adjuncts whose role is Locative. I propose a further specification to identify PP adjuncts as defective GCs, namely (28) below:

(28) A PP adjunct does not consitute a GC unless its role is [Locative]

The statement in (28) accounts for the examples of English and Spanish possessive pro-nouns inside PP adjuncts given in (29):

(29) a. Juan$_i$ vio a Ana$_j$ en su$_{i/j/k}$ casa.
a'. Juan$_i$ saw Ana$_j$ in his$_{i/k}$/her$_{j/l}$ house.
b. Juan$_i$ vio a Ana$_j$ delante de su$_{i/j/k}$ casa
b'. Juan$_i$ saw Ana$_j$ in front of his$_{i/k}$/her$_{i/l}$ house.

In (29) the [Locative] PPs consitute CFCs by themselves. Therefore, both the subject and the object (and also somebody else in the discourse) are possible antecedents for the pronominal, regardless of the preposition used.

At this point, I want to propose a new definition of *governing category* that differs from Rivero's (1991). I claim that this modification is necessary to account for all the data I have provided in Spanish and English:

(30) a. is a *governing category* for in Spanish iff is the minimal category

containing and a governor for and

(i) is a pronominal inside a verb complement or
(ii) is a pronominal inside an adjunct whose role is [Locative].

b. is a *governing category* for in English iff is the minimal category
containing and a governor for and

(i) is a pronominal inside an adjunct whose role is [Locative]

3.3. PRONOMINALS INSIDE PP COMPLEMENTS OF NP

There is a third possible kind of PP containing a pronominal. In this case the PP functions as complement of a noun. Binding in DPs, discussed by Rivero (1991), should present no problems in the case of pronominals. At first glance, we may regard either the DP or the embedded PP as their subjectless binding domain.

(31) a. Juan$_i$ vio una foto de él$_{i/j}$ en la revista.
a'. Juan$_i$ saw a picture of him$_{*i/j}$ in the magazine.
b. Juan$_i$ le mostró a Pedro$_j$ una foto de él$_{i/j}$.
b'. Juan$_i$ showed Pedro$_j$ a picture of him$_{*i/j}$.

Once again, the pronominals in (31a-b) are allowed to corefer with the subject (*Juan*) and also with the object if there is one (*Pedro*). However, (31a'-b') show that the GC for the pronoun is extended to the whole clause in English.

The next step is to analyze the data where we find a pronoun coreferring with an R-expression to see what kind of violation is taking place in those cases. Consider the following DP:

(32) a. La foto de Ana$_i$ de ella$_j$
The picture of / by Ana by / of her.
b. [$_{DP}$ la [$_{N'}$ foto Ana] [$_{PP}$ de ella]]]
c. [$_{DP}$ la [$_{N'}$ foto de Ana] [$_{NP}$ ella]]]

In this DP the binding domain for the pronominal *ella* is either the PP, as in (32b), or the lower NP, as in (32c). Otherwise, it could not be free to corefer with *Ana*. Surprisingly, both *de Ana* and *de ella* can be interpreted as Agent / Possessor or Theme. Assuming that only prepositions introducing the latter role have full semantic content, a further problem arises in Spanish -but not in English, where this possibility is ruled out- be cause in (32b) *Ana*, interpreted as Agent, is coindexed with the pronominal through an m-command relation. Moreover, in (32c), *ella*, interpreted as Agent, c-commands the R-expression, in violation of Condition C of the Binding Theory. It might be the case that a modification of this condition, claimed to be universal, is necessary in order to account for cases like (32), where the R-expression with the thematic role Agent c-commands (i.e. binds) the pronominal. At the same time, we can argue that in these cases explained above, pronominals are allowed to be bound inside the DP, because they are free inside their GC, i.e the PP complement of a noun. In this way, there is no violation of Condition B of the BT.

In sum, the binding of pronominals occuring in PP complements of nouns faces no problems for the BT, since Condition B is respected inside the PP. On the other hand, these cases seem problematic for R-expressions, as they are bound by pronominals whose thematic role is Agent, in violation of Condition C.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper I have analyzed the binding relations in Spanish reflexives and pronominals contrasting them with their English counterparts. I presented evidence that supports Huang's distinction between two different kinds of GCs to account for the possible coindexations. On the one hand, Spanish and English reflexives require a "complete" binding domain that includes the reflexive, a governor for the reflexive and an accessible antecedent. The notion of accessibility in Spanish refers now to those DPs / NPs with the semantic feature [+animate]. Furthermore, I have shown that there is no need for the notion SUBJECT, i.e. AGR or INFL, as a possible antecedent for Spanish anaphors.

On the other hand, I have argued that pronominals have "defective GCs", i.e. GCs that lack an antecedent for the pronoun. In this way, we can account for the fact that an NP outside a defective GC can be coindexed with pronominals without violating Condition B. As I have mentioned earlier, there are several types of defective GCs, the most common being NPs and PPs. I have claimed that in a language like Spanish PPs must be considered weak binding domains for the pronominals, since they depend on the argument structure of the verb used. Roughly speaking, a PP argument in Spanish is a subjectless binding domain (but never in English), while a PP adjunct (in English as well as in Spanish) bearing a role other than [Locative] is not. Some exceptions to this are found in a few idiomatic expressions, where even a Beneficiary adjunct can form a CFC (cf. (25b-b') in section 3.2.1 above). Idioms always show some peculiarities that have to do more with semantics than syntax, so I will not see these data as problematic for the proposal made here.

At the end of this paper, a theoretical problem emerges. The role and value of the three Principles upon which the traditional BT is based is not so important as many linguists had thought. In fact, if these Principles cannot account for all the data we may find cross linguistically, they should not be used to give a universal account of binding. Taking this for granted, it is necessary to search for a better analysis of the relation between anaphors / logophors / pronouns and their antecedents. Within the minimalist framework, the most recent approach to binding, that has been first proposed by Chomsky (1992), we may think of several possibilities, always paying attention to the spec-head agreement requirement, rather than to variable notions such as *GC, Accessibility*, and those "false" universal Principles. These possibilities are lines for further research that I would like to pursue.

WORKS CITED

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht. Foris.

Chomsky, N. 1986a. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1986b. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 417-454. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Fontana, J. M. and J. Moore 1993. VP-Internal Subjects and Se-Reflexivization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 501-509.

Giorgi, A. 1987. The Notion of Complete Functional Complex: Some Evidence from Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 511-518.

Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument Structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Haegeman, L. 1991. *Introduction to Government and Binding*. Cambridge Blackwell Publishers.

Hestvik, A. 1991. Subjectless binding domains. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9: 455-496.

Koster, J., and E. Reuland, eds. 1991. *Long Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: CUP.

Lasnik, H. 1991. On the Necessity of Binding Conditions. In R.Freidin (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, pp.7-28.

Padilla, J. A. 1990. On the Definition of the Binding Domains in Spanish: Evidence from Child Language. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Pica, P. 1987. On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. In *Proceedings of NELS* 17, vol.2, 483-499. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Reuland, E. J., and J. Koster.1991. Long-distance anaphora: An overview. In Koster and Reuland 1991, 1-26.

Rivero, M. L. 1984. Binding in NPs. *Generative Studies in Spanish Syntax* 1985, 165-82.

* * *

↑ INDICE