According to Saito 1992, positions created by scrambling must i) disappear at LF, ii) be reanalyzed as an A-position, or iii) be reanalyzed as an operator position. In (1a) and (1b), in Korean, for example, a pronoun and an R-expression in scrambling position display a c-commanding capability, a typical property of an element in an A-position. A reflexive, on the other hand, as in (1c), obviates Condition C, acting as if it were in an operator position.

(1) a. * kui-rul nae-ka John-u emeoni-eykey t tolyo ponaessta
  he-Acc. I-Nom. J.-Gen. mother-Dat. back sent
  ‘Him, I sent t back to John’s mother.’

  b. John-eykey casin-u emeoni-ka t simpurum-ul sikieststa
  J.-Dat. self-Gen. mother-Nom. errand-Acc. made
  ‘To John, self’s mother made an errand t.’

  c. casin-ul John-i t pinanhayststa
  self-Acc. J.-Nom. blamed
  ‘Self, John, blamed t.’

  Note further in (2) that a bare form of the reflexive must remain in an operator position at LF; if it disappeared from the scrambling position (i.e., Saito’s option i)), the construal pattern established after scrambling would not be recovered.

(2) a. John-i [Mary-ka casin-υl pinanhayststako] sayngkakhanta
  J.-Nom. M.-Nom. self-Acc. blamed think
  ‘John, thinks that Maryj blamed self υ.’

  b. casin-υl John-i [Mary-ka t pinanhayststako] sayngkakhanta
  ‘Self υ, John, thinks that Maryj blamed t.’

  Such data as (1) and (2) lead us to conclude that the pronouns and R-expressions arrive at an A-position, while reflexives end up with an operator position after scrambling. This conclusion raises an intriguing question: Why do scrambling positions vary depending on the category moved by scrambling? Because the type of a lexical category does not alter the nature of movement (e.g., subject-raising is invariably A-movement, whether raising involves
a pronoun, a reflexive, or an R-expression), it casts serious doubt about the dual nature of the landing site of scrambling.

If we assume that reflexives occur as NP complements of D, as in (3), we can avoid the arbitrary nature of scrambling.

(3) \[ DP \{ D \{ NP \{ N \{ casin \} \} \} \} \]

In the structure (3), the reflexive is deeply embedded in the DP; in principle, it cannot c-command others. The perfect grammaticality of (1c) and (2b) is now explicable, as Condition C remains intact. In conjunction with the segment structure of May 1985, the construal pattern of (2b) also follows; only the matrix John, not the downstairs Mary, interacts with casin via c-command.

Not only does this approach eliminate the arbitrary dichotomy of scrambling (thereby unifying the landing site), it also sharpens the nature of anaphoric binding. Reflexives lack a full specification of referential features (number, gender, and person; see Chomsky 1981). Consequently, reflexives – as opposed to the pronouns and R-expressions, which rise from N to D to check the [referential]-feature of D – remain in their insertion position (see Longobardi 1994 for the N-to-D raising of the pronouns and R-expressions). When D selects an anaphoric complement, the [ref]-feature of D will only be licensed by virtue of binding, viz., c-command and coindexation with elements outside the DP.
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