

Binding Theory I. For each ungrammatical sentence below, name the principle of Binding Theory that is violated. Draw a box around the anaphor, pronoun, or R-expression that is in violation of the principle of Binding Theory you identified. If the noun you boxed is bound, underline any nouns that bind it.

To make it clearer what I have in mind, I have done (1) for you. Explanation (which I'm giving to you for clarity, but you don't need to write this out for the examples below): *She* binds *Kate* because (i) *she* c-commands *Kate* and (ii) they are co-indexed. *Kate* is an R-expression. According to Principle C, R-expressions cannot be bound. Yet *Kate* is bound. So (1) violates Principle C, and is thus ungrammatical.

- (1) * She_i lost Kate_i's flashlight. Principle C
(2) * Jack_i remembered that himself_i had met Desmond before.
(3) * He_i wanted Jack_i to run a complete *tour de stade*.
(4) * He_i was not happy to discover that Jack_i hurt himself_i.
(5) * Jack_i considered him_i lucky not to have broken a bone.
(6) * Jack_i vowed that he_i would take better care of him_i.

Binding Theory II. One overarching question, about the sentences in (7) and (8) below. The question (as you will explore in the real questions a–d below) is this: **Why does (8b) have only one of the two interpretations you might expect?**

The background is this: There are two kinds of *give* sentences, the kind with the prepositional goal (7a), and the “double object construction” (7b). Both sentences in (7) seem to mean basically the same thing, and have the same options. Some “him” won a prize and Bill received the prize from Sue. The prizewinner can be Bill, or somebody else.

- (7) a. Sue gave the prize that he won to Bill.
b. Sue gave Bill the prize that he won.

The similar-looking pair of sentences in (8) don't have as many meaning possibilities. Bill won a prize, and some “him” received it from Sue. However, the one who receives the prize can be Bill or somebody else in (8a), but it *cannot* be Bill in (8b). The question

here is asking you to explain why Bill can't be the one who receives the prize from Mary in (8b).

- (8) a. Sue gave the prize that Bill won to him.
- b. Sue gave him the prize that Bill won. ← *him* cannot be Bill.

Also, note that the phrase *the prize that he/Bill won* is complex. We don't really know how to draw this structure; however, we do know a few things about it. One is that it is a constituent, standing in a place where noun phrases go. Another is that inside this constituent is an entire clause (a relative clause), a whole sentence basically, with tense and everything. So, *the medal*, or *the prize that he won*, or *the prize that John says Mary bought in Texas four years ago*, etc.: all are constituents, all go in the places where nouns go. So, even if you can't draw the tree for this complex phrase, knowing this much should enable you to answer these questions. Most relevantly: something inside a complex phrase like this is not going to c-command something outside the complex phrase.

- a. In (7a), does *he* bind *Bill* if they have the same index?
- b. In (7b), does *Bill* bind *he* if they have the same index?
- c. Why doesn't (7b) violate Principle B even when *he* and *Bill* have the same index?
- d. Why can't *him* be *Bill* in (8b)?

Binding Theory III. Arson determination.

First, consider the sentence in (9). The scenario is this: There was a fire, Sue told the insurance agent that Mary started the fire.

- (9) Sue_s told the insurance agent that Mary_m started the fire at Bill_b's restaurant.

There are two clauses here, which means there are two TPs. One is inside the other; the main verb of the inner one is *start* and the main verb of the outer one is *tell*. There are two possible meanings, corresponding to which clause the PP *at Bill's restaurant* is attached to:

- i. We aren't told where Sue made the allegation, but the fire was at Bill's restaurant.
- ii. Sue was at Bill's restaurant making the allegation, we aren't told where the fire was.

Now, consider (10), which is different in that the allegation is now that Bill (not Mary) started the fire.

(10) Sue_s told the insurance agent that he_b started the fire at Bill_b's restaurant.

The sentence in (10) does not have the same two types of meanings that (9) did. In particular, the first meaning has disappeared:

- i. ~~We aren't told where Sue made the allegation, but the fire was at Bill's restaurant.~~
- ii. Sue was at Bill's restaurant making the allegation, we aren't told where the fire was.

Questions for you:

1. For reading (i), which clause is the PP attached to? (outer/higher or inner/lower)
Inner/lower.
2. Which noun phrase(s) (if any) bind(s) *Bill* in (10) on reading (i)?
he binds *Bill*.
3. Which noun phrase(s) (if any) bind(s) *Bill* in (10) on reading (ii)?
None. *he* does not c-command *Bill*.
4. What Principle(s) of Binding Theory rule(s) out reading (i) of (10)?
Principle C (*he* cannot bind *Bill*, but it does in (i)).