## CAS LX 522 <br> Syntax I

## 7

Binding theory, NPIs, c-command
(4.3)

## C-command domains

- In the first case, the NP John c-commands the NP himself. But not in the second case.



## Principle A

Principle A of the Binding Theory (preliminary) An anaphor must be bound.


A is for anaphor? That's good enough for me.

## Principle A

- We now know why these are ungrammatical too:
I) *Himself saw John $_{i}$ in the mirror.

2) *Herself ${ }_{i}$ likes Mary's father.
3) *Himselff likes Mary's father ${ }_{i}$.

- There is nothing that c-commands and is coindexed with himself and herself.
- The anaphors are not bound, which violates Principle A.


## Binding domains

- But this is not the end of the story; consider
I) *John $n_{i}$ said that himself ${ }_{i}$ likes pizza.

2) *John ${ }_{i}$ said that Mary called himself ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$.

- In these sentences the NP John c-commands and is coindexed with (=binds) himself, satisfying our preliminary version of Principle A-but the sentences are ungrammatical.


## Binding domains

Principle A of the Binding Theory (revised)
An anaphor must be bound in its binding domain.

Binding Domain (preliminary)
The binding domain of an anaphor is the smallest clause containing it.

- It seems that not only does an anaphor need to be bound, it needs to be bound nearby (or locally).


## Binding domains

I) John ${ }_{i}$ saw himselff in the mirror.
2) John ${ }_{i}$ gave a book to himself $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}}$.
3) *John $n_{i}$ said that himself is a genius.
4) John $_{\mathrm{i}}$ said that Mary dislikes himself $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{i}}$.

- What is wrong? John binds himself in each case. What is different?
- In the ungrammatical cases, himself is in an embedded clause.


## Pronouns

1) *John saw him $_{i}$ in the mirror.
2) John $n_{i}$ said that he is a genius.
3) John ${ }_{i}$ said that Mary dislikes him $_{i}$.
4) John saw him $_{j}$ in the mirror.

- How does the distribution of pronouns differ from the distribution of anaphors?
- It looks like it is just the opposite.


## Principle B

## Principle B of the Binding Theory

A pronoun must be free in its binding domain.

## Free

Not bound

1) *John saw him $_{i}$.
2) John's mother saw him ${ }_{i}$.

B is for bpronoun, that's good enough for me.

## Principle C

- We now know where pronouns and anaphors are allowed. Consider the following.
- *Stuart ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ saw him ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ in the mirror.
- Stuart,'s mother saw him in the mirror.
- *He ${ }_{i}$ saw Stuart ${ }_{i}$ in the mirror.
- His $_{\mathrm{i}}$ mother saw Stuart ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ in the mirror.


## Principle C

- What's going wrong with these sentences? The pronouns are unbound as needed for Principle B. What are the binding relations here?
- *He ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ likes John ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$.
- *She ${ }_{i}$ said that Mary $y_{i}$ fears clowns.
- His $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}}$ mother likes John ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$.
- His mother said that John $_{i}$ fears clowns.



## Principle C

- Binding is a means of assigning reference.
- R-expressions have intrinsic reference; they can't be assigned their reference from somewhere else.
- R-expressions can't be bound, at all.

Principle C of the Binding Theory An R-expression must be free.

C is for r-eCspression, that's... oh, never mind.

## Principle A

An anaphor must be bound in its binding domain.
Principle B
A pronoun must be free in its binding domain.

## Principle C

An R-expression must be free.

## Binding

$X$ binds $Y$ iff $X$ c-commands $Y$ and $X$ and $Y$ are coindexed (a.k.a.:" $Y$ is bound by $X$ ").

Free
Not bound

## Binding Domain

The binding domain of an anaphor is the smallest clause containing it.

## Constraints on interpretation

- If we put together a tree that isn't interpretable, the process (derivation) is sometimes said to crash.



## Constraints on interpretation

- Binding Theory is about interpretation.
- Only a structure that satisfies Binding Theory is interpretable.



## Constraints on interpretation

- If we succeed in putting together a tree that is interpretable (satisfying the constraints), we say the process (derivation) converges.



## I hadn't seen anyone ever lift a finger yet.

I) Pat didn't invite anyone to the party.
2) Pat does not know anything about syntax.
3) Pat hasn't ever been to London.
4) Pat hasn't seen Forrest Gump yet.
5) Pat didn't lift a finger to help.
6) Pat didn't have a red cent.
7) *Pat invited anyone to the party.
8) *Pat knows anything about syntax.
9) *Pat has ever been to London.
10)*Pat has seen Forrest Gump yet.
II)*Pat lifted a finger to help.
12)*Pat had a red cent.

## Licensing

- NPIs (Negative Polarity Items) are permitted, given "license to appear" by a negative expression. Without a licensor, an NPI is not possible.
I) John didn't invite Mary/anyone to the party (, did he?)

2) John invited Mary/*anyone to the party (, didn't he?)
3) Nobody invited Mary/anyone to the party (, did they?)

- NPIs are licensed by negation in a sentence.
- But it isn't quite as simple as that. Consider:
I) I didn't see anyone.

2) *I saw anyone.
3) *Anyone didn't see me.
4) *Anyone saw me.

- It seems that simply having negation in the sentence isn't by itself enough to license the use of an NPI.
- Negation has to precede the NPI?

5) *The picture of nobody pleased anyone.

## Negative Polarity Items



## Pondering, some apparent early disobediehce

- Young kids (5-6 years) seem to accept sentences like (I) as meaning what (2) means for adults.
I) Mama Bear is pointing to her.

2) Mama Bear is pointing to herself.

- Suppose that, contrary to appearances, kids do know and obey Principle B. Look carefully at the definitions of Binding Theory. If Principle B isn't the problem, what do you think kids are getting wrong to allow (I) to have the meaning of (2)?
- Think in particular about how you decide which index to assign to her. What is the implication of having the same index? What is the implication of having different indices?

