

Syntax II – Class #11

Domains for Binding

1. Binding & Empty Categories

Principles A, B, C: 3 principles for 3 kinds of NP

Principle A: An anaphor must be bound in its Binding Domain

- (1) a. Wallace washed himself.
- b. Wallace believes himself to be a fine inventor.
- c. * Wallace believes himself is a fine inventor.

Principle B: A pronoun must be free in its Binding Domain

- (2) a. * Wallace_i likes him_i.
- b. *Everybody_i likes him_i.
- (3) a. * Everybody_i considers him_i to be a genius.
- b. *Wallace_i wants him_i to like Gorgonzola.
- (4) a. Wallace_i thinks that he_i is a fine inventor.
- b. Everybody_i thinks that he_i is a genius.

Principle C: An r-expression must be free.

- (5) a. * He_i likes Wallace_i.
- b. *He_i likes everybody_i.
- (6) a. * He_i thinks Wallace_i is a fine inventor.
- b. *He_i thinks everybody_i is a genius.
- (7) a. His_i mother likes Wallace_i.
- b. ?* His_i mother likes everyone_i.
- (8) a. His_i mother thinks Wallace_i is a fine inventor.
- b. *His_i mother thinks everybody_i is a genius.

a. NP-movement & anaphora

Anaphors in object position; passivization involving same relation

- (9) a. Mary washed herself.
- b. Mary was washed ___ by the rain.

Anaphors in infinitival subject position; passivization involving same relation

- (10) a. Wallace considers himself to be a fine inventor.
- b. Wallace was considered ___ to be a fine inventor.
- (11) Wallace seems ___ to like cheese.

Impossibility of anaphors or NP-trace with antecedent beyond local finite clause

- (12) a. * John knows that Mary expects himself to win.
b. *Wallace & Gromit heard that there arrived some pictures of themselves in the mail.
- (13) a. * John seems that it is likely to win.
b. *A train seems that there arrived.
c. * Many students seem that there were beaten up (by the police).

- Numerous further parallels not found...

Anaphors as objects of prepositions

- (14) a. Wallace told Wendolene about himself.
b. *Wallace was told Wendolene about ___.

Anaphors included inside embedded subjects

- (15) a. Wallace and Gromit thought that stories about each other would pass the time.
b. *Wallace & Gromit were thought that stories about ___ would pass the time.

Generalization: no passive or raising from case-marked positions

- Exception to correlation with passivization, exception to PRO/overt NP complementarity

- (16) a. Wallace wants Gromit to fetch his slippers.
b. Wallace wants himself to be a great inventor.
c. * Gromit was wanted to fetch Wallace's slippers.
- (17) a. * Wallace alleged Gromit to be the fiercest dog in town.
b. *Wallace alleged PRO to be the fiercest dog in town.
c. Gromit was alleged to be the fiercest dog in town.

...passivization from position where neither PRO nor full-NP can go.

b. Wh-movement & r-expressions

- (18) a. Who thinks that Wallace likes him?
b. *Who does he think that Wallace likes?

c. PRO

- Obligatory control when directly under appropriate verbs

- (19) a. Wallace_i permitted his dog_j to wash himself_{*i/j}.
b. Wallace_i promised his dog_j to wash himself_{i/*j}.
- (20) a. Wallace persuaded Gromit to fetch his slippers.
b. Wallace tried to forget about Wendolene.
- (21) a. Wallace asked to leave.
b. Wallace asked Gromit to leave.

- Non-obligatory control in wh-complements, subject clauses etc.

- (22) a. Wallace figured out how to fix the toaster.
 b. Wallace asked how to fix the toaster.
 c. * Wallace promised his dog how to fix the toaster.
 d. * Wallace permitted his dog how to fix the toaster.
 e. * Wallace tried how to fix the toaster.
- (23) a. This is the cheese [Op [to eat]]
 b. [To eat this cheese] would be incredible.

d. Movement analysis of anaphora in Chomsky 1986

- (24) Jean se lave souvent dans le jardin. [French]
 Jean SE washes often in the garden
 ‘Jean often washes himself in the garden.’

2. Binding Domains: Cross-linguistic differences

a. Long-distance anaphors (varying clause types): apparent parameterization

Domain 1: English

smallest XP containing subject (distinct from anaphor) or finite Infl

Domain 2: Polish, Danish, Norwegian

first independent tense beyond Domain 1

- (25) a. Jan_i opowiada Piotrowi_j o sobie_{i/*j}/nim_{*i/j}
 Jan_i-NOM talk Piotr_j-DAT about self_{i/*j}/him_{*i/j}
 ‘Jan talks to Piotr about himself/him.’ [Polish: Reinders-Machowska 1991]
- b. Ania_i uderzy" a Kasię_j swoją_{i/*j}/jej_{*i/j} lalkę
 Anna_i-NOM hit Kasia_j-ACC self"s_{i/*j}/her_{*i/j} doll-INSTR
 ‘Anna hit Kasia with her doll.’
- (26) a. Jan_i kaza" Piotrowi_j zbudować dom dla siebie_{i/j}/niego_{*i/*j}
 Jan_i-NOM ordered Piotr_j PRO_i to-build house for self_{i/j}/him_{*i/*j}
 ‘Jan ordered Piotr to build a house for him.’
- b. Maria_i wie, że Ania_j opowiada" a Kasię_k o sobie_{*i/j/*k}/niej_{*i/*j/k}
 Maria_i-NOM knows that Anna_j-NOM told Kasia_k-DAT about self_{*i/j/*k}/her_{*i/*j/k}
 ‘Maria knows that Anna told Kasia about herself/her.’

Domain 3: Chinese, Korean, Italian

unbounded (but see below)

- (27) Zhangsan_i renwei Lisi_j zhidao Wangwu_k xihuan ziji_{i/j/k}.
 Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu like self
 ‘Zhangsan thinks Lisi knows Wangwu likes him/himself.’ [Cole & Sung 1994]

note: the variation in binding domains shown here is slightly simplified relative to the observed cross-linguistic variation: for a fuller discussion see Reuland & Koster 1991, Harbert 1995.

b. Rarity of long-distance disjointness requirements – problem for simple parameterization

Principle B: a [+pronominal] NP must be
 a. free in its governing category or
 b. subject free (=not bound by a superordinate subject) in its anaphoric domain.
 [Anderson 1986]

- (28) a. Haraldur_i syndi mer föt a hann_j. [Icelandic: Thrainsson 1991]
 Harold showed me clothes for him
 b. Eg syndi Haraldi föt a hann.
 I showed Harold clothes for him
- (29) Petur_i ba Jens_j [PRO_i a raka hann_{*i/*j}]
 Peter asked Jens to shave him

c. Correlates of LD anaphora, unexpected under simple parameterization

- LD anaphors are monomorphemic; morphologically complex anaphors must be locally bound ('Pica's Generalization', Pica 1984, 1987)

Language	Local Anaphor	LD Anaphor
English	himself, herself etc.	—
Icelandic	sjalfur sig 'him self' hann sjalfur 'him self' hver annar 'each other'	sig
Norwegian	seg selv 'him self' ham selv 'him self' hverandre 'each other'	seg
Dutch	zichzelf 'himself' elkaar 'each other'	zich
Polish	siebie _{recipr}	siebie _{refl}
Italian	se stesso 'himself' l'uno l'altro 'each other'	se
Finnish	hän itse 'himself'	hän itse itse
Chinese	ta ziji 'himself'	ziji
Korean	caki-casin 'himself'	casin
Japanese	zibun-zisin 'himself'	zibun

- LD-bound anaphors are subject oriented; locally bound anaphors may be bound by non-subjects
- LD anaphors are reflexives, not reciprocals (Yang 1984)

- ‘Blocking Effect’ in LD-anaphora: found in languages without agreement; not found in languages with agreement (Cole & Sung 1994)

- (30) a. Zhangsan_i renwei wo_j zhidao Wangwu_k xihuan ziji_{*i/*j/k}.
Zhangsan think I know Wangwu like self
‘Zhangsan thinks that I know that Wangwu likes self.’
- b. Zhangsan_i renwei Wangwu_j zhidao wo_k xihuan ziji_{*i/*j/k}.
Zhangsan think Wangwu know I like self
‘Zhangsan thinks that Wangwu knows that I like myself.’
[Chinese: Cole & Sung 1994]
- (31) Chelswu_i-nun [nay_j-ka casin_{*i/j}-ul sarangha-n-ta-ko] sayngkakha-n-ta.
Chelswu-TOP I-NOM self-ACC love-PRES-DECL-COMP think-PRES-DECL
‘Chelswu thinks I like him.’
[Korean: Cole & Sung 1994]
- (32) Gianni_i suppone che tu_j sia innamorato della propria_{i/j} moglie.
Gianni supposes that you are in love with self’s wife
‘Gianni supposes that you are in love with his/your wife.’
[Italian: Cole & Sung 1994]
- (33) Joni telur a eg hafi tala vi sigi.
Jon believes that I have talked to self.
‘Jon believes that I have talked to self.’
[Icelandic]

- Outside the local domain, there is no complementarity between pronouns and anaphors (with *very* limited possible exceptions: see Icelandic examples above)

Head-movement analysis: LD anaphors are in fact *locally* bound, as a consequence of covert head-to-head movement to Infl of clause in which anaphor is bound. [cf. Pica 1987; Battistella 1989; Cole, Hermon & Sung 1990; Cole & Sung 1994; Cole & Wang 1996.]

d. Outstanding mysteries: non-core anaphora, logophors

- possibility of split antecedents & ‘strict identity’ for ‘non-core’ anaphora
- non-c-commanding discourse anaphora
- uncertain status of various expressions in, say, English