It can be said that **the president** in the first tree diagram is higher up the tree in relation to its anaphor **himself.** This is not the case in the second tree diagram. That is, the antecedent binds its anaphor if it is in the right position, which is when it **c-commands** it. In the first tree structure ,***the president*** **c-commands** its anaphor (*himself*);but in the second tree structure ***the president*** does not **c-command** its anaphor (*himself*). Accordingly, (*himself*) in the first sentence is bound ;whereas in the second sentence it is unbound, correctly predicted to be ungrammatical. Putting the notion of **c-command** in a nutshell ,it is the requirement that "the antecedent should occur higher up in the structure than the constituent which it binds." (A. Radford ,1997:75) Therefore, "the c-command condition on binding" is that " a bound constituent must be c-commanded by an appropriate antecedent." (A. Radford ,1997:75) This means that "restriction on binding is one which crucially involves the structural relation **c-command** -and this relation is defined in terms of the relative structural positions occupied by the anaphor and the antecedent. " (A. Radford ,1997:76) It is in this respect that "the binding of anaphors can be given a straightforward characterization in structural terms" (A. Radford ,1997:76) ;and this ,in turn, "provides further support for our claim that sentences have a hierarchical constituent structure." (A. Radford ,1997:76)