

The Bird Phenomenon: Negations, Binding, Quantifiers, and the Definiteness of a Pronoun

Hsiu Wen Wendy Cheng
Syracuse University
University of Southern California

Abstract

I propose “The Bird Phenomenon”. This is the phenomenon of the interaction between binding and the definiteness of the bound pronoun. To consistently account for this phenomenon, these mechanisms are proposed, for the working of this interaction between binding and the definiteness of the bound pronoun: The “meta-counteraction of negations”, is the meta-counteraction of two negations. This meta-counteraction gives rise to binding, and the definiteness of the bound pronoun in this binding. This meta-counteraction of negations yields the value [+1] or [+0], which gives rise to the feature [+/- definite] to this bound pronoun. Further, I propose the paradigm “The Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals at the Head of a Determiner Phrase”, in which the default base and the default features of this paradigm are specified. Further, I propose that the Bird Phenomenon presents that in language production and perception, each minimal building block of different types or categories composes freely to infinite patterns of sentences without constraint. These proposals in the Bird Phenomenon are the basis for the architecture of a Determiner Phrase, and the architecture of how Negations computes with Binding and Definiteness.

Key words: Binding, Definiteness, Pronoun, Negation, Counteraction, Value, Feature, Determiner phrase, Default, Minimal building block, Infinite

The Bird Phenomenon is my proposal of an architecture, which fills the gap of the literature, whose:

I. Aim is to represent the consistent mechanism which accounts for the interactions of negations, the quantifier “no”, and binding. In addition, how the definiteness of the bound pronoun of binding is given rise to is devised.

II. Composition is two mechanisms of languages: 1. The mechanism which accounts for: negations and their meta-counteractions, which give rise to binding and the value [+1] or [+0], the latter of which gives rise to the definiteness of a bound pronoun. 2. The feature mechanism [+]/[-], which accounts for articles, indexicals, quantifiers, and the elements in a determiner phrase.

The Bird Phenomenon

1. The Preliminaries

1.1 Unless, Negation, and Meta-Counteraction

I propose “the Bird Phenomenon”. Following Quine (1959): “Unless is equated with the negative material conditional *if not*”. Hence, the conjunctive “unless” carries with it a negation Neg.

I propose that: (A) this negation Neg meta-counteracts another negation in a sentence, illustrated in (1)(i)a, b. (B) This negation Neg is an adjunct with this counteraction. (1)(i)a, b suggest that this negation Neg, counteracts the negation “not” and “no”. (C) With the antecedent NP, ANP, in a complex NP: (I) ANP binds the pronoun, illustrated in (1)(ii)a, b.

(1)(i)a. Unless no bird₁ is there, John shoots it₁.

Chufeinalimei niao₁, A tan ta₁.

unless there no bird A shoot it

“Unless no bird is there, A shoots it.”

b. Unless there is not a bird₁, John shoots it₁.

Chufei mei niao₁, A tan ta₁.

unless no bird A shoot it
 “Unless there is not a bird, A shoots it.”

(1)(ii)a. [Bill who takes a bird is here]₁, and John shoots it₁.
 Dai le niao₁de B zaizhe, A tan ta₁.
 take_{LE} bird_{DE} B at here A shoot it
 “[B who takes a bird is here]₁, and A shoots it₁.”

b. If [Bill who a bird follows is here]₁, John shoots it₁.
 Ruguo you niao₁gensuide B zaizhe, A tan ta₁.
 if_{Existence}bird follow_{DE} B at here A shoot it
 “If [B who a bird follows is here]₁, A shoots it₁.”

1.2 Meta-Counteraction of Negation Computes Prior to Binding

A meta-counteraction is the counteraction of two negations, which yields an accessible antecedent without negation for binding, and a new meaning of the clause after this meta-counteraction.

I propose that: A meta-counteraction of negations computes prior to binding, illustrated in (1)(iii)c. (1)(iii)c illustrates an accessible antecedent for binding, after the meta-counteraction of negation is exercised.

I propose that: (A)“Unless” scopes over VP, illustrated by (1)(iii)a, d, e. In (1)(iii)a, d, e, this R expression “the bird” is the accessible antecedent for binding. Hence, “unless” and the Neg it carries do not scope over this NP antecedent. Further, by the meaning of (i)(iii)a, d, e, “unless” scopes over VP. (B) Binding does not go by the existential “there” with “unless”, illustrated in the contrast in binding between (1)(iii)a, b.

(1)(iii)a. Unless a bird₁ is here, John shoots e₁. /it₁.
 Chufei niao₁ zaizhe, A [tanshe e₁. / tan ta₁.]
 unlessbird at here A shoot shoot it
 “Unless a bird₁ is here, A shoots e₁. /it₁.”

b. Unless there is a bird₁, John shoots e*₁. /it*₁.
 Chufeiyou niao₁, A [tanshe e*₁. / tan ta*₁.]
 unless there bird A shoot shoot it
 “Unless there is a bird₁, A shoots e*₁. /it*₁.”

c. [Unless no bird₁ is here]₁, John shoots it₁.
 Chufeimei niao₁ zaizhe, A tan ta₁.
 unless no birdat here A shoot it
 “[Unless no bird₁ is here]₁, A shoots it₁.”

d. Unless here is a bird₁, John shoots it₁.
 Chufeizheli you niao₁, A tanta₁.
 unless here_{Existence}bird A shoot it
 “Unless here is a bird₁, A shoots it₁.”

e. Unless Bill takes a bird₁, John shoots it₁.
 Chufei B dai niao₁, A tan ta₁.
 unless B take bird A shoot it
 “Unless B takes a bird₁, A shoots it₁.”

II. The Proposed Architecture of the Mechanisms of:

A. The Meta-counteraction of Negations and Binding, and the Definiteness of the Bound Pronoun

B. The Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and the Elements in a Determiner Phrase

2. Meta-counteraction of Negations and Binding

A meta-counteraction of negations transforms a negated antecedent of binding, to a definite NP, or an NP which denotes no object. This gives rise to token or definite binding, or type or indefinite binding.

2.1 Definite or Token Object Binding and None-Finite Clause, Binding, and No NP

This bound pronoun, is in the embedded non-finite clause, and this no NP antecedent is in the matrix clause. In this structure, this no NP binds this pronoun. This is illustrated in (1)(iv)i, j, k, l, in contrast to the binding in (1)(iv)a, b, c, d, e, h, m. This is the type of binding: definite or token object binding, which is discussed in the literature. In 3.4, I propose the other type of binding: “indefinite or type object binding”.

(1)(iv)a, b, c, d, e, h, are acceptable, for indefinite or type object binding. (1)(iv)a, b, c, d, e, h, are unacceptable, for definite or token object binding.

(1)(iv)a. If Bill who takes no bird₁ appears, John shoots it_{1/*1}.

Ruguomeidainiao₁ de B chuxian, A tan ta_{1/*1}.

if not take bird_{DE} B appear A shoot it

“If B who takes no bird₁ appears, A shoots it_{1/*1}.”

b. [Bill does not take a bird₁ / Bill takes no bird₁], and John shoots it_{1/*1}.

B meidai niao₁, A tan ta_{1/*1}.

B not take bird A shoot it

“[B does not take a bird₁ / B takes no bird₁], and A shoots it_{1/*1}.”

c. If Bill who no bird₁ follows is here, John shoots it_{1/*1}. / (If) No bird₁ follows Bill, John shoots it_{1/*1}.

Ruguomei niao₁gensui de B zaizhe, A tan ta_{1/*1}. / (Ruguo) Mei niao₁gensui B, A tan ta_{1/*1}.

if no bird follow_{DE} B at here A shoot it if no bird follow B A shoot it

“If B who no bird₁ follows is here, A shoots it_{1/*1}. / (If) No bird₁ follows B, A shoots it_{1/*1}.”

d. If Bill takes no bird₁, it_{1/*1} is shot by no one. / h. Bill takes no bird₁, and John shoots it_{1/*1}.

Ruguo B meidai niao₁, ta_{1/*1}beiwu ren tan. / Bmeidai niao₁, A tan ta_{1/*1}.

if B not take bird it_{BEI}no person shoot / B not take bird A shoot it

“If B takes no bird₁, it_{1/*1} is shot by no one. / B takes no bird₁, and A shoots it_{1/*1}.”

e. Bill takes no bird₁, and it_{1/*1} is shot by no one.

B meidai niao₁, ta_{1/*1}beiwu ren tan.

B not take bird it_{BEI}no person shoot

“B takes no bird₁, and it_{1/*1} is shot by no one.”

f. Bill takes not a bird₁, and John shoots it₁.

B xidaibu-shi niao₁, A tan ta₁.

B take not bird A shoot it

“B takes not a bird₁, and A shoots it₁.”

g. Bill takes a no-bird₁, and John shoots it₁.

B xidai “fei niao₁”, A tan ta₁.

B take no bird A shoot it

“B takes a no-bird₁, and A shoots it₁.”

h. If Bill takes no bird₁ to no one, John shoots it_{1/*1}.

Ruguo B meidai niao₁geiwu ren, A tan ta_{1/*1}.

if B not take bird to no one A shoot it

“If B takes no bird₁ to no one, A shoots it_{1/*1}.”

i. Bill takes no bird₁ to John who will shoot it₁.

B buhuidainiao₁gei hui tan ta₁de A.

B not take bird to will shoot it_{DEA}

“B takes no bird₁ to A who will shoot it₁.”

- j. Bill takes no bird₁ to no one who will have it₁ shot.
 B buhuidainiao₁gei hui rang ta₁bei tan de wu ren.
 B not take bird to will have it BEIshoot DE no person
 “B takes no bird₁ to no one who will have it₁ shot.”
- k. Bill takes no bird₁ to have it₁ shot.
 B daiwu niao₁rang ta₁bei tan.
 B take no bird have it BEI shoot
 “B takes no bird₁ to have it₁ shot.”
- l. Bill does not take a bird₁ to have it₁ shot.
 B buhuidainiao₁rang ta₁bei tan.
 B not take bird have it BEIshoot
 “B does not take a bird₁ to have it₁ shot.”
- m. If no bird₁ of these birds₂ is there, John never shoots [it_{*1}/them₂].
 Ruguo zhexieniaodang-zhong meiyouniaozainabian, A cungweitan [ta_{*1}/tamen₂].
 if this CLbird among no bird at there A never shoot it them
 “If no bird₁ of these birds₂ is there, A never shoots [it_{*1}/them₂].”

2.2 The Assertion of the None-Existing Object

By 2.1, with definite or token object binding, based on the assertion of the none-existing object denoted by the NP antecedent of binding, binding does not go. This is illustrated in the contrast between (1)(iv)a, b, c, d, e, h, and (1)(iv)f, g.

2.3 Definite/Token Binding Versus Indefinite/Type Binding

I propose the distinction between the definite binding or token binding, versus, the indefinite binding or type binding. The former is the binding of the pronoun, whose reference is a specific, token object. This is illustrated in (1)(iv)n, o. In (1)(iv)n, o, the bound pronoun co-refers with the antecedent NP “a bird”. This bound pronoun denotes a specific bird. This is the kind of binding discussed in the literature. The binding into a none-finite clause in 2.1 is one example of this definite and token binding.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (1)(iv)n. John takes a bird, and Bill shoots it. | (1)(iv)o. There is a bird, and John shoots it. |
| A qu le yi zhi niao, B tan ta. | You yi zhi niao, A tan ta. |
| A take LE one bird B shoot it | there one CL bird, A shoot it |
| “A took a bird, and B shot it.” | “There is a bird, and A shoots it.” |

2.4 Type or Indefinite Binding: The Pronoun “It” Denotes an Indefinite, Type Object “A Bird”.

In addition, I propose the type of binding of the pronoun, which reference is an indefinite, type object. This is illustrated in (1)(v)a to (1)(v)l. In (1)(v)a to (1)(v)l, the pronoun “it” co-refers with the no NP or negative NP. In (1)(v)a to (1)(v)l, the pronoun “it” denotes an , type object “a bird”. **Negation, which scopes over the binding antecedent, is the exact context for type or indefinite binding.**

The acceptability of (1)(v)a to (1)(v)l is marked with the type binding of the pronoun.

- (1)(v)a. If Bill takes no bird₁, John never shoots it₁.
 Ruguo B meidai niao₁, A cungweitan ta₁.
 if B not take bird A never shoot it
 “If B takes no bird₁, A never shoots it₁.”
- b. Bill who does not take a bird₁ is here, and John never shoots it₁.
 Mei dai niao₁de B zaizhebian, A cungweitan ta₁.
 not take bird DE B at here A never shoot it
 “B who does not take a bird₁ is here, and A never shoots it₁.”

- c. With a bird₁ not being there, John never shoots it₁.
 Niao₁meizaizhebian de hua, A cungwei tan ta₁.
 bird not at here _{DE-SITUATION} A never shoot it
 “With a bird₁ not being there, A never shoots it₁.”
- d. If [Bill who takes no bird₁] never appears, John shoots it₁.
 Ruguomeidai niao₁de B cungweichuxian, A tan ta₁.
 if not take bird_{DE} B never appear A shoot it
 “If [B who takes no bird₁] never appears, A shoots it₁.”
- e. Bill who takes no bird₁ is absent, and John shoots it₁.
 Mei dai niao₁de B meichuxian, A tan ta₁.
 not take bird _{DE}B not appear A shoot it
 “B who takes no bird₁ is absent, and A shoots it₁.”
- f. If Bill who does not take a bird₁ is not here, John shoots it₁.
 Ruguomeidai niao₁de B meizaizhebian, A tan ta₁.
 if not take bird _{DE} B not at here A shoot it
 “If B who does not take a bird₁ is not here, A shoots it₁.”
- g. Unless Bill who takes no bird₁ is here, John shoots it₁.
 Chufeimeidai niao₁de B zaizhebian, A tan ta₁.
 unless not take bird _{DE} B at here A shoot it
 “Unless B who takes no bird₁ is here, A shoots it₁.”
- h. [Not that Bill who a bird₁ never follows is here], John shoots it₁.
 Bushi niao₁cungweigensui de B zaizhebian de hua, A tan ta₁.
 not bird never follow _{DE} B at here_{DE-SITUATION}A shoot it
 “[Not that B who a bird₁ never follows is here], A shoots it₁.”
- i. If Bill takes no bird₁, no one shoots it₁.
 Ruguo B meidai niao₁, mei ren tan ta₁.
 if B not takebird no person shoot it
 “If B takes no bird₁, no one shoots it₁.”
- j. Bill takes no bird₁, and no one shoots it₁.
 B meidai niao₁, mei ren tan ta₁.
 B not take bird no person shoot it
 “B takes no bird₁, and no one shoots it₁.”
- k. If Bill takes no bird₁, someone does not shoot [it₁/e₁].
 Ruguo B meidainiao₁, mou-ren buhui tan ta₁.
 if B not take bird someone not shoot it
 “If B takes no bird₁, someone does not shoot [it₁/e₁].”
- l. If Bill takes no bird₁, not that someone will shoot it₁.
 Ruguo B meidai niao₁, buhuishimou-ren hui tan ta₁.
 if B not take bird not. be someone will shoot it
 “If B takes no bird₁, not that someone will shoot it₁.”

2.5 This Mechanism of Counteractions between Negations of Proposal

By 2.4, Negation, which scopes over the binding antecedent, is the exact context for type or indefinite binding. This mechanism of counteractions of negations, is a precise one. **The counteractions of negations, in the antecedent clause, excluding the negations, in the adjunct, in the antecedent clause, yields either the value [+1] or [+0]. This value [+1] gives rise to the feature [-definite], to the bound pronoun, and the type or indefinite binding. This value [+0] gives rise to the feature [+definite], to the bound pronoun, and the token or definite binding.** This is illustrated in (1)(vi)a to (1)(vi)j, and (1)(vii)a to (1)(vii)g. (1)(vii)b illustrates the antecedent clause with an adjunct.

- (1)(vi)a. Bill who a bird₁ follows is not [here/there], and John shoots it₁.
 Niao₁gensui de B buzai [zhebian/nabian], A tan ta₁.
 bird follow_{DE} B not at here there A shoot it
 “B who a bird₁ follows is not [here/there], and A shoots it₁.”
- b. Bill does not take a bird₁, and John shoots it₁.
 B meidai niao₁, A tan ta₁.
 B not take bird A shoot it
 “B does not take a bird₁, and A shoots it₁.”
- c. {[Unless a bird₁ follows Bill]₁ / [Unless Bill takes a bird₁]₁}, John (never) shoots it₁.
 {[Chufeiniao₁gensui B]₁ / [Chufei B xidai niao₁]₁}, A (cungwei) tan ta₁.
 unless bird follow B unless B take bird A never shoot it
 “{[Unless a bird₁ follows B]₁ / [Unless B takes a bird₁]₁}, A (never) shoots it₁.”
- d. Not [Bill who does not take no bird₁ is here], and John shoots it₁.
 Bushi [meidailingzhi niao₁de B zaizhe] dehua, A tan ta₁.
 not nottake zero_{CL}bird DE B at here DE-SITUATION A shoot it
 “Not [B who does not take no bird₁ is here], and A shoots it₁.”
- e. Unless Bill does not take no bird₁, John shoots it₁.
 Chufei B bushimeiyoudainiao₁, A tan ta₁.
 unless B not not take bird A shoot it
 “Unless B does not take no bird₁, A shoots it₁.”
- f. [Not that Bill does not take no bird₁], and John shoots it₁.
 Bushi B bushimeiyoudai niao₁de hua, A tan ta₁.
 not B not nottake bird DE-SITUATION A shoot it
 “[Not that B does not take no bird₁], and A shoots it₁.”
- g. Unless Bill takes no bird₁ to no one, John will shoot it₁.
 Chufei B meidai niao₁geiwu ren, A tan ta₁.
 unless B not take bird to no one A shoot it
 “Unless B takes no bird₁ to no one, A will shoot it₁.”

In (1)(vii)a to (1)(vii)e, the bound pronoun “it” denotes a specific token object: “the bird”.

- (1)(vii)a. If Bill who no bird₁ does not follow is here, John shoots it₁.
 Ruguomeiyouniaobugensui de B zaizhe, A tanta₁.
 if no bird not follow DE B at here A shoot it
 “If B who no bird₁ does not follow is here, A shoots it₁.”
- b. If Bill does not take no bird₁ to no one, John shoots it₁.
 Ruguo B bushi [meidai niao₁ / dailingzhi niao₁] gei [wu/ling] ren, A tan ta₁.

if B not not take bird take zero_{CL}bird to no zero one A shoot it
 “If B does not take no bird₁ to no one, A shoots it₁.”

c. Unless Bill does not take a bird₁, John shoots it₁.

Chufei B meidai niao₁, A tan ta₁.
 unless B not take bird A shoot it
 “Unless B does not take a bird₁, A shoots it₁.”

d. [Not that Bill takes no bird₁], John shoots it₁.

Bushi B meidai niao₁de hua, A tan ta₁.
 not B not take bird_{DE-SITUATION}A shoot it
 “[Not that B takes no bird₁], A shoots it₁.”

e. Bill takes a bird₁, and John shoots it₁.

B dainiao₁, A tan ta₁.
 B take bird A shoot it
 “B takes a bird₁, and A shoots it₁.”

3. The Feature Paradigm of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals in a Determiner Phrase

3.2 Presents a Paradigm of the Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals in a Determiner Phrase.

3.1 In this paradigm, the proposal is as follows:

(I) The features [+object], [+object type] for the article “a”. This proposal is verified by (1)(viii)a, b. In (1)(viii)a, b, albeit the quantifier “no”, the negative NP antecedent “a no-bird”, or “not a bird”, token-binds this pronoun “it”. Hence, this article “a”, asserts the object, denoted by this “a NP”. An “a NP” denotes a type, or an indefinite object, such as “a bird”. This article “a”, hence has the default features of [+object], and [+object type]. Analogously, this definite article “the”, in a “the NP”, which denotes a specific object, demonstrates the feature [+object token]. This is illustrated in this NP “the bird”.

(1)(viii)a. Bill takes not [a/the bird]₁, and John shoots it₁.

B bushi dai [yi zhi/zhe zhi] niao₁ A tan ta₁.
 B not take one_{CL} this_{CL} bird A shoot it
 “B takes not [a/the bird]₁, and A shoots it₁.”

b. Bill takes [a no bird/the no bird]₁, and John shoots it₁.

B dai [yi zhi “fei niao₁”/zhe zhi “fei niao₁”], A tan ta₁.
 B take one_{CL} no bird this_{CL} no bird A shoot it
 “B takes [a no bird/the no bird]₁, and A shoots it₁.”

(II) For this paradigm, of the elements, in a determiner phrase, the feature [+object] is the default of this paradigm of the elements in a determiner phrase. This is illustrated by (I).

(III) (1)(viii)a to (1)(viii)c, and either instance of the type binding, with a negated antecedent, illustrates that [+object] is the default of this paradigm. The quantifier “no” or “not any”, supplies the value of “zero”, to the feature [+object], illustrated in (1)(viii)c, d. The value [+0] to the feature [+object] results in type binding in (1)(viii)d. The value [+0] does not influence this default feature [+object], that the type binding goes.

(1)(viii)c. Bill takes [no birds]₁, and John shoots them_{1Token/1Type}.

B dai [ling zhi/de bushi] niao₁, A tan tamen_{1Token/1Type}.

B not zero_{CLDE} no bird A shoot them
 “B takes [no birds]₁, and A shoots them_{1Token/1Type}.”

d. Bill does not take any bird, and John shoots it_{1Type}.

B mei dai renhe niao A tan ta_{1Type}.

B not take any bird A shoot it

“B does not take any bird, and A shoots it_{1Type}.”

(IV) (1)(viii)e illustrates the feature [-definite] of the quantifier “any”. In (1)(viii)e, this meta-counteraction between the quantifier “no” and the feature [-definite] of the quantifier “any”, yields [+definite] of this NP. This NP binds this definite pronoun “this one”, and token-binds this pronoun “it”, in (1)(viii)e.

(1)(viii)e. Bill takes no any bird₁, but this one_{1Token}. Bill does not take any bird, and John shoots it_{1Token}.

B bushi dai renhe niao, jiu zhe yi zhi.

B not take any bird just this one CL

Bill takes no any bird₁, and John shoots it_{1Token}.

(V) (1)(viii)c illustrates interestingly that “no” is either a negation or quantifier, but not both. When this “no” is a negation, a token binding is possible. This NP “no birds” denotes “objects other than birds”. When this “no” is a quantifier, which yields the value [+0], a type binding, from an identical antecedent, is possible. This yields the distinction of plural objects or zero object denoted by this “no NP”. Interestingly the negation of this quantifier “no” is not negating the default feature in this paradigm, of “object”, or the feature “plurality”, but the type of the objects.

(VI) (1)(viii)f illustrates that with the binding of a definite pronoun, the plurality of the definite antecedent and this bound pronoun is to match.

(1)(viii)f. Bill does not like all of the birds₁, and John shoots [all₁/some₁/one₁/them₁/it_{*1}].

B bu xihuan suoyou niao₁, A tanshe [quanbu₁/yi xie₁/yi zhi₁/tamen₁/ta_{*1}].

B not like all bird A shoot all one_{CL} one_{CL} them it

“B does not like all of the birds₁, and A shoots [all₁/some₁/one₁/them₁/it_{*1}].”

(VII) In 3.2, [±distance] at the section of indexicals, refers to the distance from the speaker to the indexed object, denoted by this indexical NP. Either of these indexicals “this”, or “these”, indicates close distance, from the speaker, to the indexed object, in comparison to these indexicals “that” and “those”.

(VIII) [+number] could be either [+singular] or [+plural].

(IX) These sentences in (1)(viii)g illustrate the distinction of the definiteness, between the quantifier “every”, and the quantifier “any”. One could have seen definite objects, instead of indefinite objects.

(1)(viii)g. “*He saw any bird.” “He saw every bird.”

*A kan dao renhe niao. A kan dao mei yi zhe niao.

A see to any bird. A see to every one_{CL} bird

“A saw any bird.” “A saw every bird.”

(X) The default features of this paradigm, of “the Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals, in a Determiner Phrase”, are the features appear in each item. The feature [+number] is the default of [+singular] and [+plural]. By (I)(II)(III), [+object] is the default feature of this paradigm.

3.2 “The Paradigm of the Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals in a Determiner Phrase” is proposed as follows:

Articles:

“The” [+number], [+definite], [+object token]

“A” [+singular], [-definite], [+object type]

Indexicals:

“This”, “That” [+singular], [+definite], [+object token], This: [-distance], That: [+distance]

“These”, “Those” [+plural], [+definite], [+object token], These: [-distance], Those: [+distance]

NPs:

“A Generic NP” [+number], [-definite], [+object type]

Quantity Phrases:

“Some” [+number], [+object token], [-definite]: E.g. (1)(viii)f

“One” [+singular], [+object token], [-definite]: E.g. (1)(viii)f

Quantifiers:

“Any” [+number], [+object token], [-definite]:

“Every” [+singular], [+object token], [+definite]:

Default Features: [+number], [+/-definite], [+object type/+object token]

Default Base: [+object]

This feature mechanism works with the mechanism of meta-counteraction of negations. After this meta-counteraction of negations, the quantifier phrase “no NP”, which appears to denote no object, could be the antecedent of binding. This supports the feature [+object] is the default of the quantifier “no”, and the default of the elements in a determiner phrase, which includes: articles, indexicals, quantifiers, and generic NPs. This default feature [+object] of all NPs is further proved with the pair reading of this sentence: “no one likes no one”. After the meta-counteraction of negations, this sentence reads “Everyone likes someone”. Hence, either of these two no-NPs denotes objects.

4. Conclusion

I propose “The Bird Phenomenon”. This is the phenomenon, of the interaction between binding and the definiteness of the bound pronoun. To account for “The Bird Phenomenon”, these mechanisms are proposed: The “meta-counteraction of negations”, is the meta-counteraction of two negations. This meta-counteraction gives rise to binding, and the definiteness of the bound pronoun in this binding. This meta-counteraction of negations yields the value [+1] or [+0], which gives rise to the feature [-definite] or [+definite] to this bound pronoun. Further, I propose the paradigm “The Features of Articles, Indexicals, Quantifiers, and Nominals, in a Determiner Phrase”, in which the default base and the default features of this paradigm are specified.

These proposals in the Bird Phenomenon are the basis for the architecture of a determiner phrase, and the architecture of how negations compute with binding and definiteness.

References

Cheng, H.W. W. (2011). *Binding and Reciprocity*. Unpublished Manuscript.

Cheng, H.W. W. (2011). *Quantifiers and Predicates*. Unpublished Manuscript.

Quine, W. V. O. (1959). *Methods of Logic*. Revised Edition, Henry Holt and Company, Inc., New York.